

THE  
AMERICAN QUARTERLY  
CHURCH REVIEW.

VOL. XXII.—JANUARY, 1871.—No. 4.

---

ART. I.—LATE WORKS ON ANGLICAN ORDERS.

1. *Hadden's Apostolical Succession in the Church of England.*
2. *Dr. Lee's Validity of the Holy Orders of the Church of England.*
3. *Bailey's Defence of Holy Orders in the Church of England.*

The last two years have witnessed most important additions to our long list of works on Anglican Orders. This revival of interest in a question never, at any time, entirely devoid of interest is noteworthy, and we naturally seek its cause. Is that to be found in the Vatican Council, or the wish to present our case to the Orthodox Eastern Church, or the desire to resolve fresh doubts at home, or the purpose to meet fresh objections on the part of Romish adversaries? Or are we to look for it in those mysterious and unconscious impulses which, when the time of need arrives, set unconnected minds at work in separate labors, all tending to one great result?

The staple of Romish attack, at all events, had not greatly changed. Few things, indeed, in all the history of religious controversy are more dreary than the "endless iterations" of Romish objections; the wearisomely monotonous way in which the

changes are rung over and over to the same dull tune, on Nag's Head story, and Barlow's Consecration, and the Edwardine Ordinals, and the doctrine of intuition, till one is forced to cry,—

"Semper ego auditor tantum? nunquamve reponam,  
Vexatus toties rauci Theseide Codri?"

It is a sad and shameful story which tells how, on the part of Rome, this controversy has been managed. Nor is there in all of it a sadder page than that which records what one could say—did he say it in a petulant recognition of the weakness of his cause?—who had once received and rested in the Orders of his English mother. How had "the gold become dim?" how was "the most fine gold changed?" when John Henry Newman, in writing what to every man must be a solemn thing—to him how solemn!—*Apologia pro vitâ suâ*, could say of the Church of England:

"As to its possession of an Episcopal succession from the time of the Apostles, well, it may prove it, and if the Holy See were so decided, I will believe it, as being the decision of a higher judgment than my own; but for myself, I must have St. Philip's gift, who saw the sacerdotal character on the head of a gaily-attired youngster, before I can by my own wit acquiesce in it, for antiquarian arguments are altogether unequal to the urgency of visible facts."

There is much, always, in the way of putting things. Taken out of the way in which it is put, Dr. Newman's argument, if such it can be called, amounts to this: First, That things do not wear that look to him in the Anglican Church, which he, *a priori*, thinks they ought to wear in any real Church; and secondly, that "antiquarian arguments," that is, in plain English, *historical evidence*, can have no weight as against the absence of things demanded on the ground of his *a priori* impressions. In a letter explanatory of the passage in the *Apologia*, Dr. Newman adds, that the "inquiring into Anglican Orders" (that is, we ask our readers again to observe, *the historical evidence for Anglican Orders*) is "dreary" to him, and leads, after all, only to "a probable conclusion."

All this is merely saying that a failure to come up to a preconceived ideal nullifies historical facts; that he to whom historical facts seem "dreary" is absolved from any obligation to consider them; and that nothing but mathematical demonstrations—for, be it remembered, they and probable conclusions form, (except, per-

haps, in Romish logic) the dichotomy of all conclusions—are of any value. One would suppose that the enunciation of such positions would be their sufficient answer. If any of our readers care to take them up at greater length they may turn to Appendix No. XX, in Dr. Lee's volume.

The rank and file of Roman controversialists must, indeed, here as well as elsewhere, be looked on very differently from the way in which we have hitherto been wont to regard them. Père Gratry's late letters have established the existence of two schools among the controversialists of Rome, one of which dishonestly falsifies history, while the other honestly, but blindly, accepts their falsifications. The existence of a falsifying school of writers *école de mensonge*—had frequently been asserted, and as frequently denied. It can never be denied again with the smallest hope of gaining any credence for the denial. Nor can the exposure be shuffled off as a merely "probable conclusion." It stands, settled and established, in all its deformity and shame.

While, then, one class of Romish writers is characterized by that moral, or immoral, hardihood which holds that falsehood "well stuck to" is as serviceable as the truth, there is another and doubtless, a numerous class which simply repeats, parrot-like and by rote, the lesson it has been taught. Neither of these classes is likely to be reached by historical argument or evidence touching our English Orders. But surely there must be those, and in increasing numbers, who will listen to such evidence and argument. And to these it is worth while to speak, for these it is worth while to labor; while ever, for the Anglican Communion, the fullest and most searching examination of testimony is the one, single thing to be desired.

It is not likely that much can be added to the evidence finally collected and summed up in the three works, the names of which stand at the head of this Article. It may be, indeed, that confirmatory testimony may still be lurking in diaries or letters that have never yet seen the light; but it can be only confirmatory. The existing chain may admit of strengthening, but there is no missing link to be supplied. For we cannot count the mere absence of the record of Barlow's consecration as a missing link. The *lacuna* is entirely filled by other testimony, positive as well as negative; while it has been even said of those who still deny

Barlow's consecration, that "they have borrowed the arms at once of Strauss and Paulus, and have given their sanction to the weapons of infidelity by using them to throw doubt upon the facts of history. The weapons, let us remind them, are double-edged; they may cut away in some minds their trust in one class of truths, but it will be by destroying their confidence in all." In a word, the denial is now reduced to Pyrrhonism, pure and simple.

Each of the works named above has its own especial value. But Mr. Bailey's must, we think, be allowed to head the list. Its careful and, as matters stand, exhaustive collection of State papers and other documents is of great importance; and we are glad to learn is reprinted in octavo, with the purpose of furnishing a copy to every bishop who sat in the Vatican Council. We cannot, also, but be grateful for the very excellent chapter on Jurisdiction. This is, indeed, not only one of the most important, but one, also, of the most difficult questions in the controversy. Not that the difficulty is one inherent in our Anglican position, but that it grows out of the fact that Romish writers so constantly assume the very point at issue, *i. e.* that jurisdiction descends from St. Peter through the Papacy. The chapter which treats of this topic deserves the most careful study.

To Dr. Lee's book, we are compelled, however reluctantly, to take some exceptions; and of these it will be necessary to speak at some little length.

We shall, doubtless, be considered by some as over scrupulous, if not something more, when we object to the application of the term Sacrament to Holy Orders, so constantly made by Dr. Lee. And yet we do object to it, not, as we verily believe, without sufficient reason.

The difference between us and Rome as to the number of the Sacraments is not one, it must be remembered, of mere definition, and the controversy is not, therefore, a mere logomachy. With the entire question as to the number of the Sacraments we do not propose, here, to deal. We take it up only so far as it is connected with Holy Orders.

The Council of Trent, [Sess. vii, Can. vi.] asserts that the Sacraments of the New Law "confer grace on those who do not place an obstacle in the way." These sacraments of the New Law, are declared [Sess. vii, Can. i.] to be no "more or less"



than the seven usually named, and asserted, each and every one of them, to be "truly and properly a Sacrament," "instituted by Jesus Christ, our Lord." And it is further assumed, [Sess. vii, Can. iv.] that the grace communicated by them is the "grace of justification." For all these terms, therefore, and so for Holy Orders, there is claimed not only an outward sign, but "Christ's institution" and "justifying grace" as well.

In full agreement with this is the teaching of the Trentine Catechism. After quoting from the *Civitas Dei*, St. Augustine's definition, "A sacrament is a sign of a sacred thing," it gives an enlarged definition in these words: "A sacrament is a visible sign of an invisible grace, *instituted for our justification.*" [Part ii, Chap. i, Question iii.] It then, [Quest. iv.] says, "The more fully to develop this definition, pastors must explain its respective parts." Proceeding with this development it explains the phrase "sacred thing" in St. Augustine's definition to mean "the grace of God which sanctifies us, and adorns us with the habit of all the divine virtues." [Quest. vii.] Then, [Quest. viii.] it explains a sacrament more fully by saying that "it is a thing subject to the senses, and possessing by the divine institution at once the power of signifying and accomplishing sanctity and righteousness." The number of these sacraments is fixed at seven. [Quest. xiv.] It then sets forth the effects of these sacraments as "principally two;" first, "the grace commonly called by the sacred doctors *justifying*," (Quest. xxi.) which belongs to all the seven, [Quest. xxiii.] and second, which, however, is not common to all, but peculiar to them,") "the character which they impress on the soul." So that here again, to all the seven is attributed not only Christ's institution, but justifying grace as well.

Now the Anglican Church is at war with Rome touching the introduction of Christ's institution and justifying grace into the definition of a sacrament. She asserts, as plainly as Rome does, that both these things belong to a sacrament. But she also asserts, (and here she joins issue with the Trentine teaching), that in none of those things to which Trent gives the name "Sacrament of the New Law," do Christ's institution and justifying grace meet, except in Holy Baptism and the Blessed Supper.

The application then, of the term Sacrament to Holy Orders involves either an acceptance of Roman doctrine, or else a use of

the term which requires a new definition; a definition differing from that of Rome as well as from that of England.

Again, on p. 7 of his volume Dr. Lee holds the following language; he is speaking of the Preface to the Ordinal:

"In this Preface, while the major or chief orders are retained, the minor orders, however, are not referred to. They existed in the Mediæval Church of England, and were almost identical with those still conferred in all parts of Roman obedience as a preparation for the major orders. Three of the seven among Roman Catholics are now called "sacred" or "holy," viz. :—the (1) priest, (2) deacon, and (3) subdeacon—the remaining four being respectively (4) acolyte, (5) exorcist, (6) reader and (7) doorkeeper. In the Eastern communions the division is not quite the same, nor indeed are the orders themselves precisely identical with those of the Latin Church. Here in England the office of *clericus* (clerk) has been retained, and in many cathedrals certain officials have been appointed ever since the Reformation to undertake some of those duties which had been previously performed by persons in minor orders."

Now it is surely an inaccurate statement to say that the Church of England retained the three major orders as set forth by the mediæval and the modern Roman Church. For what are those three major orders? According to the Trentine as well as the mediæval teaching, they are the priesthood, the diaconate, and the subdiaconate. This comes clearly out in chapter ii, of Session xxiii: while in the Trent Catechism [Part ii, Chap. vii, Quest. xii.] it is said that "according to the uniform tradition of the Catholic Church" the number of orders being seven, "the greater or *holy* [orders] are subdeaconship, diaconship, and priesthood."

How this definition and arrangement of Orders came about is well stated by Bishop Pearson. [Minor Works, Vol. I, p. 275.]

"In the first place the schoolmen, flattering the Roman Pontiff, have excoGITATED this ground for denying a distinction of order [between bishops and presbyters.] For they bring the sacrament of the Eucharist into the definition of orders, and they limit and determine it by this sacrament. So Soto roundly defines: Orders is a sacrament in which is conferred special power to consecrate the body and blood of Christ. To the same purpose speak others.\* From this notion once admitted, it is easy to argue thus.

\* As specimens of "others," take the definition of Alphonso Liguori, [*Theol. Mor.* Vol. II, p. 424, Ed. Bassini 1847.] *Ordo est sacramentum quo traditur potestas circa Eucharistiam rite administrandam: or that of Penone, which is, indeed more guarded, quo spiritualis potestas confertur sacramenta conficiendi &c. [Praelectiones (abridged) Vol. II, p. 379.]*

The Trent Catechism says, The power of order has references to the real body of Christ our Lord, in the Holy Eucharist. [Part II, Chap. vii, Quest. vi.]

All orders have reference to the Eucharist; wherefore, orders may be diverse so far as they diversely concur in the celebration of the Eucharist. But since the highest act connected with the Eucharist is the act of consecration, and since this belongs to the priest, (that is the presbyter,) as such, and the bishop concurs in such consecration, no otherwise than the presbyter, there is, therefore, no distinction of order between presbyter and bishop."

Whether this definition was or was not devised for the benefit of the Bishop of Rome, it was worked most diligently and thoroughly for his behalf, and against the Episcopate. It culminated in the arguments of the Jesuits and others at Trent; where every effort was made to declare the Papacy alone to be of Divine right, and the Bishops to hold from the Pope. Guetteè [Hist. des Jesuites, Vol. I, p. 118] gives the reasoning of Lainer the General of the Jesuits in these words:

"All which comes from God is *jure divino*; but Jesus Christ gave to Peter and his successors active and absolute authority in the Church: wherefore, the pope possesses this authority in its entirety, *jure divino*, consequently, the jurisdiction of the bishops does not come from God, except mediately and by the pope." We need not pursue the matter further.

Now, however much such speculations may have befogged our Anglican Reformers in the beginning, and however much they may have told later on, on the individual opinions of even such men as Hooker, Field, and Mede, it is certain that our Ordinal contains the protest of the Anglican Church against them all. So far is its Preface from *retaining* as Dr. Lee says "the major or chief orders," as they were then held and known in the West, that it does not even name them, "priest, deacon, subdeacon;" and it does name three other orders, and no more, "bishops, priests, and deacons," said in the Preface to have existed "from the Apostles' time," and declared, in the body of the Ordinal, to have been appointed by the "Holy Spirit," and the "Divine providence" of Almighty God.

The Ordinal, therefore, records the entire emancipation of our Reformers from those scholastic speculations about orders, which had resulted so disastrously in destroying the divinely appointed constitution of the Church, and bringing to naught the power of its entire Episcopate. If some afterwards so forgot its clear declarations as to call those who recurred to them bringers in of novelties, that is nothing to the purpose. There those declarations are,

making no mention of any minor orders, and (with an entire incognition of the major orders as laid down by the schoolmen, and set forth at Trent,) asserting that the divinely instituted orders in the Church, are Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. When at the Savoy Conference, the title of the form for making a Bishop was changed, so that instead of "The Form of consecrating of an Archbishop or Bishop" it read "The Form of *ordaining* or consecrating &c.; and where at the same time, the words "ordination," and "ordained" were added in the Preface, all that was done was to bring the places thus changed into full agreement with the original declaration of the Preface concerning the three orders. The distinction of the order of Bishops from that of Priests was not *then* for the first time asserted. Nor was it, even, by Bancroft in his sermon at St. Paul's Cross in 1589. In either case the original declaration of the Preface was renewed, and that was all.

We may add here the doctrine of the Eastern Church as stated by the Abbé Guetteé, [*Exposition de la Doctrine*, p. 104.] La seule hierarchie divinement instituée est celle de sacrement, partagé en épiscopat, prêtre, et diaconat.

Bearing, therefore, cordial testimony to the great value of Dr. Lee's volume, we must express our earnest wish that he had not used language which, to say the least, is open to the charge of looseness and inaccuracy.

One curious fact connected with Romish doctrine concerning Holy Orders, we may touch upon in passing. It is more worth considering now, than it was before the Decree of Infallibility was passed.

In 1439 Pope Eugenius IV. issued a Decree touching the reconciliation of the Armenians with the Western Church. It is a long and carefully worded document, setting forth, at great length, the points which the Armenians are to accept; [*Labbe and Cossart's Concilia*, Vol. XIII, Col. 529.] and it is issued *ad perpetuam n memoriam*. Large space is given in it to the Sacraments; and concerning Orders the Pope thus pronounces:

"The sixth is the sacrament of orders, the matter of which is that by the delivery of which order is conferred; to the presbyterate is conferred by the porrection of the chalice with the wine and the paten with the bread; the diaconate by the giving of the book of the Gospels; the subdiaconate by

the delivery of the empty chalice with the empty paten placed upon it. The form of the priesthood is, Receive power to offer sacrifice in the Church for the living and the dead." [Col. 538.]

Now here was a difficulty and not a small one. The Church *had* always held, and *has* always held, that imposition of hands alone, with prayer, made the sign and the words requisite to a true ordination. Even Pearson, while he says that the schoolmen, and not a few more recent theologians, put the "tradition of the instruments" into the matter of the Sacrament of orders, still adds, "*Communior vero nunc evasis illorum opinio qui eam constituunt in sola manuum impositione.*" [Vol. II., p. 395, Abridged Prælections.] And this view, which he adopts, he justifies, (1) from Scripture, (2) from all the rituals of nine centuries, (3) from the Apostolic Constitutions, (4) from all the Fathers, and the Liturgists of the VIIth, VIIIth, and IXth centuries, and (5) from the custom of the Greeks and other orientals. All this certainly, gives a very tolerable *consensus*, but utterly in opposition to the decree of Pope Eugenius.

The difficulty was felt; but how to get out of it? It would not do to try here the plan followed in the case of Honorius, and talk about a private letter, and the utterance of a private doctor. There was nothing private about the document. It was a Papal decree, pure, simple, and undeniable. What was to be done?

Bellarmino appears to have contrived the explanation which has since been generally used for the benefit of Eugenius, or those who differ from him, as the case may be. Let us take the explanation as given by Alphonso Liguori [*Theol. Mor.* Vol. II., p. 428.]:

"Eugenius is only speaking of the *integral matter and form* which he intended to give to the Armenians who desired to be aggregated to the Latin Church; wherefore, it was not needful to designate the imposition of hands because they already used that."

This is, if one may be pardoned a slang phrase, "a very neat dodge." But the answer to it is easy. The Armenians used water in baptism, bread and wine in the Eucharist, and chrism in confirmation; and yet Eugenius carefully mentions each of these things as the matter of these sacraments—for, of course, he numbers confirmation as a sacrament. It would have been very convenient, doubtless, for many persons coming after him, if he had spoken differently in the case of orders, from his way of speaking

in the case of other sacraments. But, excepting this convenience and its opposing inconveniences, there is no ground for saying that he did. And so, for all we can see, a Papal definition stands to-day, deserted, given up, contradicted, and denied by the *communior opinio* of Roman theologians.

To return again for a moment to the historical evidence for our Anglican Orders. We know of nothing in all history that is so abundant, whether it be direct and documentary testimony, or indirect and confirmatory. The hypothesis of a forgery of the documents thus disposed of by Mr. Haddan [p. 198]:

"Dr. Mason, or whomsoever the controversialists light upon as the possible forger, must have been so marvelous a conjurer, that [between 1604 and 1613] he first of all invented half a dozen complicated series of documents, all minutely tallying, both with each other and with all known history on the subject; and then inserted all of them, utterly unsuspected by any body, into every one of their several repositories, over no one of which he had the slightest control, and of one or two of which he literally did not know the existence—at Canterbury, Lambeth, London, Cambridge, Zurich, and the great Episcopal and Capitular archives all over the kingdom;—and that he did this with such exquisite juggling, as *e. g.*, to insert large portions into Parker's Register at different places (for the several Episcopal consecrations happened at different dates), and yet to have made them exactly fit in with all the rest, as if they had been there from the beginning, and (more marvelous still) fit in exactly also with every one of the numerous other documents elsewhere, many of which he could not possibly have ever seen."

This is admirably put. Nor is Mr. Haddan's summing up of the evidences against the Nag's Head story less acute. We are sure our readers, at least, those who may not have seen his volume, will thank us for quoting it.

"To sum up the question, we have on the one side the natural, legal, and, presumably *a priori*, certain, series of facts, respecting these consecrations, testified legitimately and regularly by the proper registrars and other records, with no internal grounds for suspecting unfair dealings with those records, and with perfect agreement between the various and independent classes into which they are divided. We have, further, independent testimony from many distinct sources, some of them out of the reach of the possibility of being tampered with, and one of them buried at Zurich, out of sight and out of knowledge until a quarter of a century since. And, besides this mass of documents, we find that every allusion, whether of friend or foe, for half a century after the facts, takes those facts for granted, whether in history, or in controversy, or in courts of law, or in solemn synod and Parliament.

"And against all this conclusive weight of evidence, attached, as it is, to a reasonable, natural, and coherent statement, there stands literally nothing except a hearsay story, repeated when once uttered in a variety of shapes, but bearing gossip and libel written on the face of all of them; in itself impossible to the degree of being absurd, and published for the first time forty-five years after date in a foreign country, and by a writer whose position precluded him from sifting, almost from knowing, the truth, had he wished to do so, and whose book and character stamp him as a virulent and reckless controversialist, who had no wish of the kind. And that story was indignantly contradicted, the instant it became really public. There is nothing to be said upon such a statement, except that if a controversial writer wishes to stamp the character of his work as worthless, and his own controversial morals as discreditable, he has the means ready at hand by adopting and maintaining the Nag's Head fable."

We wish that Mr. Bailey's Defence, in the mother tongue, might be separately printed, in an inexpensive way for general circulation.

The photosyncographic (what a fearful word!) fac simile of Parker's Register is, undoubtedly, of great value to the scholar. It brings him face to face with the actual event. He seems to be carried back to the very year 1559, and to touch hands with those whose acts placed Parker in the vacant chair of Augustine. No one, we venture to say, can look on and decipher those ancient records, and especially that grim and curious *Rituum et Cereemoniarum Ordo in consecratione Reverendissimi Doctoris Mathæi Parker*, with its historic names and strange words, without having the occasion and the sense brought home to him as they never were before.

So, too, the Latin Defensio is most valuable to scholars, and most timely in every point of view. But the Defence in English is for all the members of the Anglican Church, and we wish it might be placed in their hands. Attacks are made upon our orders in more and more covert ways than we imagine. Hints, sneers, insinuated doubts are thrown out in the chance interviews of travel or of social life, and a brief, telling treatise would be welcomed every where. An octavo edition of the Defensio, for foreign scholars, has been published. Let us try for a cheap edition of the Defence for those whose reading does not go beyond our own language.



## ART. II.—THE FALL OF THE TEMPORAL PAPACY.

No one who understood the various interdependent elements of European and especially of Italian politics could have failed to realize—even from a point of view so low and human—that when war was declared between France and Prussia the downfall of the temporal power of the Popes was decreed. Still less was it possible for Christian faith to doubt that, in an hour when the Lord seemed to have made bare His arm,—to be revealing to a skeptical age His visible control over the affairs of men—so fearful an apostasy as that which was completed on the 18th of July last would long await its swift retribution : and many a one, when they read of the thick darkness which filled St. Peter's, as the blasphemy was about to be formally proclaimed, and of the terrible peal of thunder which immediately answered it from heaven, must have felt that the Roman Papacy had at last exhausted God's long suffering, and that its doom had been pronounced. Never before, as it seems to us, in the long course of Christian history, has the overruling Providence of God been more clearly visible than it is now, in this wild rush of human policy and of secular events onward to His own destined purposes.

The immediate and inevitable result of the Franco-Prussian war was the withdrawal of the French troops from Rome. This was not so much because these troops were wanted elsewhere, as because their presence in Italy alienated the people and fomented a popular Prussian feeling stronger than the ties of the Italian Government to France ; and, therefore, thus only could France hope for Italian aid, or even secure Italian neutrality. So the French troops were recalled, leaving Rome and the Papal provinces to the protection of miscellaneous foreign mercenaries and enthusiasts ; and Italy to the revived Convention of September 15th, 1864. This was the *first* step.

The rapid and overwhelming succession of German victories which followed, soon gave especial importance to the policy of the neutral powers, any one of which, by entering into the strife, could precipitate a European war. This, in turn, gave a new degree of independence to Italy as one of these ; and upon the 29th

of August the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Visconti-Venosta, addressed to the foreign representatives of the Italy Government a very able and most significant circular. This document set forth the increasing gravity of the Roman question in the present disturbed state of Europe; distinguished between the political and ecclesiastical interests involved; pointed out both that Rome was a centre of direct intrigue against the interests, the peace, and indeed, against the very existence of the Italian Kingdom, and also that it furnished a continual pretext for popular agitation on the part of revolutionists against a form of government which they loudly declared incapable of completing the unification of Italy; and, therefore, that the prompt settlement of this question had become an imperative duty of self-preservation. The Italian Government, nevertheless, frankly recognized the interest which the other European powers had in this question, in its ecclesiastical aspects, and especially their right to require that the "Head of the Catholic Church" should not be so subjected to any one power as to enable the latter to make use of the Pope and of his authority, for the purpose of interfering in the affairs of other nations. The Convention of September was, moreover, plainly declared no solution of this Roman question, but simply a guarantee that this solution should not be sought by violent means. Recognizing fully the complication of these apparently antagonistic interests, and yet at the same time believing that the other powers had no wish to prolong a condition of things so perilous to Italy, the Italian Government proposed to arrange with the other Catholic powers a satisfactory system of guarantees against the ecclesiastical difficulty; and, finally, the circular quietly suggested that the suppression of the temporal papacy would be quite as truly for the good of other nations as for Italy itself,—“since it is not only in Italy,” it concludes, “that the antagonism between the religious sentiment and the spirit of civilization and liberty disturbs the conscience and spreads moral disorder among the people.”

Such is an abstract, not so much of the *language* of this circular, as of its meaning, when it is filled out with those little additions which diplomacy prefers to suggest and imply and take for granted as mutually understood. The public did not know of this document until lately; but it was *another* most important step in the

development of what the Government terms the policy of going to Rome by moral means.

Upon the second of September, ere this circular had fairly reached those to whom it was addressed, came the victory of Sedan and the capture of the Emperor Napoleon (the news of which reached Florence on the 4th), and upon the 4th itself, the Paris revolution, the overthrow of the Empire, and the proclamation of a French Republic. The immediate effects of these events upon the Roman question was twofold. By substituting those French statesmen who had *opposed*, for the Government which had *exacte*d the September Convention, this revolution gave Italy a virtual release from its obligations; and by greatly strengthening the revolutionary party in Italy, and giving them new hopes of overthrowing the monarchy, it made it more necessary than ever that the Government should at once, by satisfying the popular demand for their "natural capital," deprive the revolutionists of their power to rouse the people.

All Italy understood this in a moment. The Government must not only have appreciated, but it must have acted instantly upon this new state of things; for, upon the 6th, it was announced in Berne that "the Italian Government had declared officially to the Federal Council that it had decided to occupy the Roman States with troops," etc., etc., and that "an identical declaration had been addressed to all the governments, including the provisional government at Paris."

The same day—Tuesday, September 6th—Florence was all excitement. The *Opinione* had made this glad announcement in the morning, and the *Italie* of the 7th, (it is always published the evening before its nominal date) that night confirmed the joyful news by a striking leading article entitled *A Rome!* in which, assuming the fall of the temporal power as already morally accomplished, it threw itself, with a bold abruptness, most characteristic of the state of mind of intelligent men amid this hurrying onward of events, into a discussion of its meaning and results. We shall speak of this article again.

The fortnight which followed was a period of such, unflagging excitement and impatience—official utterances and the successive steps of government, popular meetings, telegrams, newspaper-leaders, plans, rumors, and speculations—all thronged and pressed

so impetuously forward to the great result which now loomed up plainly in sight, that trying to recall it now, is like trying to recall the bewildering incidents of some wild dream.

The demonstration in Florence was followed by meetings in Milan, in Turin, in Verona, in Venice, in Naples, in Palermo—one after another, seemingly in every city and town from one end of Italy to the other. Reading the telegrams, morning after morning, one could almost hear Italy—as though all her passionate earnestness had burst forth at once—with one voice demanding her Capital. The pressure upon the Government gave it the single choice of leading or being utterly overwhelmed. Troops hurried from Turin and Milan, through Florence, to one frontier; troops hurried up from Naples northward to the other; frigates, fitted out in hot haste, sailed promptly from Spezia for the papal coasts. Gen. Govone, the Minister of War, literally broke down in the midst of it, crazed by the rush and pressure of the emergency, and resigned, as it was then thought, to die.

But Visconti-Venosta had promptly anticipated all this by the issue of another circular, upon September 7th, pointing out to the cabinets of Europe the necessity of immediate action. In fact no ministry, not the monarchy itself, could, for one day, have resisted the popular will; a wand could as soon have resisted the spring flood of the Arno at mid course as the Government have told the Italian people, at this time, that they could not go to Rome. The Minister of Foreign Affairs plainly told Europe as much in this second circular—though of course in diplomatic and conventional phraseology—and declared that the security of Italy and her neutrality in the present war could only be preserved by putting an end to “a state of things which maintained in the heart of the peninsula a theocratic government in open hostility to Italy, and which, by its own confession, could only subsist by means of foreign intervention, and whose territory offers a base of operations to all the elements of disorder.”

Minghetti had, at the same time, been sent to Vienna; another confidential agent more quietly to Paris, and probably others elsewhere; and they all brought or sent back the assurance that no power was any longer disposed to interfere on behalf of one who had declared war against the very principles upon which modern governments rest, and who, claiming infallibility while he put forth

the most arrogant pretensions, set himself beyond the reach of reason and of reform.

Simultaneously, several of the first statesmen of Italy were called to Florence to advise with the Government, and Count Ponza di San Martino, an eminent nobleman of an old Piedmontese family, was selected to bear a letter to the Pope from the King of Italy. This letter and the Count's instructions bear date the 3d. They both show the Government equally determined to take possession of Rome and of the surrounding territory and thus to put an end to the *temporal* power, and profoundly deferential to the *spiritual* position of the Holy Father and "Head of the Catholic Church." They pray the Pope to accept the inevitable event with a good grace; to put himself into harmonious relations with the King and Government of Italy, offering him at the same time the guarantees promised to Europe. What the terms thus offered were, we have not as yet been officially informed; but if the statement of the papers be correct they provide that the Pope shall retain his sovereign dignity and inviolability; they include also the neutralization of the Leonine City as his residence, the free communication through Italian territory with foreign powers and churches, the preservation of the ecclesiastical institutions in Rome as well as of their property, a civil list which should support the Pope and continue to the Cardinals their present income, the renunciation of the royal right to ecclesiastical patronage, in the city of Rome itself, and a pledge of non-interference with the Italian Bishops and clergy "in the exercise of their spiritual ministry." The more these terms are studied, the more admirable, as a whole, they appear. Some interference with ecclesiastical property around Rome is absolutely essential if the Campagna is ever to be brought under proper cultivation, or Rome itself made a healthy city; but aside from this, these guarantees were all that a Pope who wished only to fulfill his spiritual duty as the head of the Roman Catholic Church could ask, and all that a government jealous for the future peace and welfare of the country could grant. In the last two particulars is quietly implied a reservation of the right of ecclesiastical patronage outside of Rome and of the right to interfere when Italian ecclesiastics transcend the bounds of their spiritual ministry.

Count San Martino saw Cardinal Antonelli and the General

of the Jesuits on Friday night, Sept. 9th, and on Saturday morning, between 10 and 11, he had a formal audience from the Pope. All the world knows his answer. *Non Possumus!* God be praised.

The next day, Sunday, September 11th, the Italian troops crossed the frontier at three several points. Gen. Cadorna, with the principal army, marched from Terni directly upon Rome itself; Gen. Bixio crossed from Orvieto, first occupied Viterbo, and then rapidly marched upon Civita Vecchia; Gen. Angioletti entered the papal territory by Frosmone and Anagni.

The day after the 12th, for, as will be noticed, not *one* of these successive days passed without its event, the Minister Guadasigilli, Sig. Raeli, by way of illustrating unmistakably the reservation just referred to in the terms offered to the Pope, addressed a circular to the Italian Bishops, which possessed in an eminent degree the merit which had characterized all the late utterances of the Government in this connection—that of plain speaking. Assuming that the Bishops were aware that the Italian troops had now entered the Roman provinces, he informs them that the Government had offered to the Pope the largest guarantees of his independence and support in the exercise of his *spiritual* power; assures them that the Government do not intend, and will not permit the least offence to the Church or to its clergy in the exercise of their *spiritual* ministry; but that it is, at the same time, “decided to fulfill its own duty to the nation, that is, not to permit the clergy, by any act or discourse, or in any other manner whatever, to attempt to stir up disobedience of the laws or of the measures of the public authority, by censuring the institutions or laws of the State; to excite contempt or dissatisfaction with the same, or to disturb the public conscience and the peace of families.” This admirable circular closes with the warning that the Government would proceed against all offenders “with all the rigor of the law;” and exhorts the clergy to act in a way “to honor their high mission and by their own moderation to impress moderation upon all others.”

The opportunity for acting upon the intention of this circular did not tarry, for the very next morning, the 13th, the three chief clerical journals of North Italy, the *Unita Cattolica* of Turin, the *Osservatore Cattolico* of Milan, and the *Ancora* of Bologna, failed to appear as usual, and the news was soon in circulation that they



had been sequestered, doubtless in each case, as in that of the *Ancora*, "for provocation and transgression against constituted order, vows, and threats of destruction of the Government, offences against the laws and even indirectly against the sacred person of the King." When these papers appeared the morning following it was in deep mourning, and their menaces, though now in a more subdued key, gave sufficient evidence of the spirit in which ultramontaniam would meet all the efforts of Italy to come to amicable terms with the Pope. In the only instance which has come to public knowledge—the infuriate Bishop of Mondovi replied to the above circular of Raeli, in the language of contempt and insolence. It is not at all improbable that the larger proportion of the Italian Episcopate and clergy only wait the *mot d'ordre* from Rome to break out into rebellion against the Government, and that this order would come if there were the least possibility of success.

Meanwhile, the Italian armies marched on. At *Civita Castellana* the Papal troops made a short resistance; but everywhere else they retired before the Italian advance. Town after town, freed from the Papal authorities, unfurled the tricolor and proclaimed provisional juntas, and shouts of welcome greeted the Italian troops at every step. Upon Thursday, the 15th, Gen. Bixio reached *Civita Vecchia*, which, after some deliberation, surrendered without contest. The same day Gen. Cadorna arrived under the walls of Rome.

And now negotiations were once more attempted. *Cavaliere Blanc*, the Secretary General of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, joined the army to take charge of this department; and Baron Arnim, the Prussian Minister at the Court of Rome, proffered his services to secure, if possible, an understanding. At his instance an armistice was granted; but it was soon announced that the Pope, deeply as he regretted the unavailing sacrifice of life that would follow, was powerless to prevent it; that *Kauzler* and *De Charette*, not he, were really masters, and that the foreign troops were determined to resist. Regarded as mere transparent hypocrisy this aroused general indignation and contempt, which subsequently proved to be undeserved. In fact the Pope consented only to such a resistance as would constitute the taking of Rome a forcible conquest, and ordered that upon the first breach all further defence should instantly cease. This should be known to his



credit. But it was not known then; it was only known that the last overtures to avoid the shedding of blood had been refused, and in a state of excited and almost angry expectation all Italy awaited, hour by hour, news from Rome.

At 1 o'clock, on Tuesday, September 20th, anxious Florence was aroused by a commotion in the streets. A man, bearing the Italian flag, and followed by a crowd wild with delight, came down the Via Tornabuoni (where we were so fortunate to be at the time), proclaiming the long expected news—*Rome was taken!* Rapidly, one after another, flags were flung out from public and from private buildings, from banks, reading-rooms, and cafés. Boys ran from street to street, with brief, hastily printed supplements, announcing that fire had been opened that morning at 5½ o'clock against Porta Pia and Porta Salaria (those who have visited Rome will remember the first, as just having been elaborately restored by the present Pope and leading to S. Agnese, and the other as leading to the Villa Albani); that at 3½ a breach had been made in the wall between the two gates; at 9½, Porta Pia was carried, and at 10 two divisions of Cadorna's army had forced the barricades and entered Rome simultaneously by these two ports of ingress. This was all we knew that day. Up went the national colors on the tall tower of the Palazzo Vecchio and from the Palazzo Terzoni (the Municipality) as confirmation of the joyful tidings.

By two o'clock the whole city was *imbandierata* (em-banner-ed) and the Stars and Stripes floated in sympathy from several American residences in the *Quartière Galileo*, outside the Porta Romana. Soon the unwilling church bells, nay, even the great bell of the Duomo, were ringing loudly and lustily; the people had everywhere taken possession of them in spite of their custodians, and, by means of relays, many of these were kept ringing for hours with scarce an interruption. A column being formed in the Piazza di Santa Trinita, and having obtained flags and a band of music from the municipality, traversed the Vie Tornabuoni, Rondinelli, Cerriani, and Calzaiuoli to the Piazza Signoria, rousing the utmost enthusiasm. Windows were thrown open, men clapped and shouted their *vivas*, ladies waved their handkerchiefs, and in the Piazza the bersaglieri on guard responded heartily. Thence the people pressed to the Pitti Palace and shouted for the King. *Viva il Rè!*

*Viva Roma, Capitale d'Italia! Viva il Rè in Campidoglio!* But the King was not in the palace at the time.

We went out again at 5. The crowds were gathering in every open space. A number of young men, who had taken possession of Giotto's campanile, were erecting a flagstaff on its level summit and had already unfurled the Italian tricolor; others were hanging lamps for illuminating the Loggia de' Lanzi. Bands of men and boys marched along the streets in every direction, relieving their exuberant excitement by shouts and clapping of hands and singing. *Scarcely a priest was anywhere to be seen.*

Again we went out at night. The Piazza Signoria was filled by such a crowd as one sees only in Italy—perhaps only in Florence—a crowd where there is no crowding. A torch-light procession escorted the music to the Loggia de' Lanzi, and for some forty minutes they listened to one patriotic air after another, their plaudits making the Piazza reëcho. Their excitement seemed unbounded; their good humor and good behavior equally so. Gentlemen with their wives and young daughters mingled freely among them in every direction, and came and went enjoying the scene with the rest. The Florentine lily in gas jets surmounted each lamp post, clusters of oil lamps hung in the loggia itself, and branches of them were thrust out from many windows. Michael Angelo's *David* stood up white and tall in the pride of conscious symbolism in the illuminated piazza; the *Perseus* of Giovanni da Bologna and Donatello's *Judith* relieved against the radiance of the loggia seemed to stand out as if their meaning had each a new and special claim to recognition, and the double row of Florence's noble sons to step from their niches along the Uffizi into the unwonted light. From the top of the campanile now blazed Bengal fires, successive red and white and green.

The music over at the loggia, again the band and banners led the way to the royal palace, where a double arch of lights blazed over the main entrance and the royal flag of Italy was flying overhead. Again the people called loudly for their King, and he came forward on the balcony three times and in gesture thanked them for their greeting, while the air was filled with *vivas*: *Viva il Re! Viva Roma! Viva l'esercito! Viva il Re in Campidoglio!* At a later hour the King went to the theatre and was there received with the same overflowing enthusiasm of loyalty, patriotism, and

wild delight at the attainment of that which, for ten years, has been the goal of every patriotic Italian's hopes and aims, the completion of Italian unity by the occupation of Rome as her *natural Capital*.

Thus, was Florentine national feeling rejoicing at the event which will be rather an injury to Florence herself. How different from the narrow provincial selfishness which once reigned upon the banks of the Arno! How full of promise for the future!

The news since received from Rome adds little as yet to what has thus been told. The gates and batteries once carried the fighting ceased; the white flag went up on every side, and the Italian troops took possession of the Eternal City. Detachments from each of the five armies occupied Rome itself, while the main body remained encamped without. Bixio came down from the Villa Pamfili, by the Via Aurelia, and entered the Porta San Pancrazio; Angioletti marched up from the Porta San Giovanni and the old Lateran; Terrero advanced along the Via di Porta Pia and halted upon the Piazza del Quirinale; while others pressed onward to the Piazza Colonna. As if by magic, tricolor banners, hitherto carefully concealed, greeted them on every side, and flowers were thrown from the windows along their routes.

The city was surrendered to the Italian forces—the Papal troops were granted all the honors of war in recognition of their gallantry and their fidelity to their flag and principles. The Leonine City was respected; but the Pope himself soon asked for Italian protection, and a regiment of bersaglieri was, therefore, encamped in the Piazza of St. Peter's, and under the windows of the Vatican; and a great popular comitia was summoned to meet on the 22d in the Colosseum, to render the thanks of the Roman people to the King and army of Italy for the liberation of their city.

Gen. Masi was put in military charge; a Provisional Giunta, including members of some of the principal Roman noble families, was constituted to assume the city government; it was announced that a *plebiscite* should be held on October 2d, when the Romans should decide upon the future of the seven-hilled city. Rome at last was free; and the Temporal Power of the Pope King was at an end *forever!*

The rejoicings in every part of Italy beggar language to describe. In fact, the Italian newspapers themselves have been

forced to give it up. After some brief accounts of the reception of the news in the chief cities, they could but publish the telegrams as they came in from every direction ; and then the very numbers of these being beyond their space to print, they have been obliged to content themselves, morning after morning, with long lists of the places from which these had been received. Very, very rarely can it be said, with such near approach to literal truthfulness, that a whole people are rejoicing.

That the seat of Government will be removed to Rome with all possible expedition, however doubtful before this event, can, we think, be no longer so. The same uprising of the Italian people which both compelled and enabled the Government to accomplish this, has at the same time proclaimed *Roma, il Capitale d'Italia* ! To satisfy this feeling, it was at once and with amusing promptness announced—in fact, even before Rome was actually occupied—that a commission had been appointed to examine the public buildings of Rome, with a view to determine what were adapted to the requirements of the various offices of the Government. The Quirinal will, of course, become the royal palace—and never again will the College of Cardinals hold their Conclave there to elect another Pope ; the Italian Parliament, meeting in the Capitol, will look down upon the Forum hoary with memories of two thousand years and more, but of no scene or day more fraught with blessings and great results to all mankind than this.

Whether the Pope will remain in Rome or not is not known as yet ; but at all events the Leonine City, which was offered him and which he refused to accept, has been admitted to vote with the rest of Rome, and has become a constituent part of the Kingdom of Italy.

Such an event certainly deserves more than a superficial examination, since an understanding of the real influences and interests which brought it about is essential to any successful attempt to forecast the probable future. Thinking men will wish to study it closely. They will see in it the result not of a single, but of a compound moral force, which must be *resolved* before its significance can be fairly perceived. Such a moral *resolution of forces*, when it can be fully accomplished, will, we are persuaded, reveal a most marvelous economy and combination of popular aims and impulses made subservient to the purposes of the politician and

statesman ; and, in the same manner, an economy and combination of the aims and purposes of human policy and statesmanship to work out the infinite designs of God.

Beginning with the simplest elements. The *people* of Italy have longed for the unification of Italy and the acquisition of old Rome, with all its venerable memories and inspiring associations, as their Capital. The radical party have long availed themselves of this feeling, and have fomented it, as a means of creating dissatisfaction with the *moderates*, the party at present in power ; and, indeed, to some extent, with the *monarchy* itself. In the language of the *Italie* (September 15th) "the Italian democracy has seen in the question of the capital too good a pretext to perpetuate agitation, to permit it to escape them." At the same time the aim of the *revolutionists* was to secure the proclamation of a republic at Rome, which so far from completing the *Kingdom* of Italy by becoming its capital, should become the centre and base of revolutionary (as it has heretofore been of reactionary) influences against it, until it should absorb the Italian provinces from it, one by one, into a grand Roman Republic ; and then, from the base of republican Italy, coöperating with the revolutionists of other nationalities, overthrow monarchy everywhere else, to construct on its ruins an universal European Republic, of which the Eternal City should be the Capital.

The victory of Sedan and the revolution in Paris, of course greatly inspirited this revolutionary party in Italy ; but it also set Italy free to act. The aim of the Government at Florence was, therefore, *in the interest of their party*, to put themselves promptly at the head of the popular movement which would have otherwise driven them from power ; and, *in the interests of the Monarchy*, to be beforehand with the revolutionists and occupy Rome before *they* were able to overthrow the Papal Government and proclaim the Roman Republic. The people with one voice acclaimed *any* hand which bore the standard that led them to Rome ; no party could refuse to support the Government in accomplishing that which all parties (save indeed the insignificant *clerical* or *black* party) demanded ; and inasmuch as Italy, by thus forestalling revolution, was acting in the interests of all monarchical Europe, no such power was at all disposed to prevent her.

The *people*, then, only aimed at the possession of their "natural

capital" and the unification of Italy; the *politicians* in power sought to give checkmate to the opposition, and, rising to a national statesmanship, to rescue the monarchy from grave peril of revolution. Of course, the former, having obtained *their* object, were satisfied and gave themselves up to rejoicing; the politicians knew perfectly well, that there were questions as grave in store, but were content to have overcome the present dangers;—they, too, had attained their immediate aims. To both of these classes the occupation of Rome was only, or at least chiefly, the acquisition of their capital and the defeat of the schemes of the revolutionists; and to them, therefore, the *questione Romana* was solved.

Setting aside, for the moment, all considerations of larger statesmanship and of an overruling Providence, and stripping the subject of all pretence and of all diplomatic phraseology and looking upon it in its more popular and political point of view—*such* were the practical motives and considerations which, in the month of September, 1870, have combined to put an end to the separate political existence of the Papal principality. Such, in other words, were the passions and interests which were utilized by the Cabinet of Florence, and such their *political* purposes in so doing.

But there is, however, a class of statesmen whose range of thought is less restricted, and to whom the occupation of Rome is chiefly important, as putting an end to the Temporal Power of the Popes; a point of view which, although much less common in Italy, is that from which the outside world will of course chiefly regard it. The occupation of their capital was an act which concerned Italy alone; but when Italy put an end to the temporal papacy—even though it was only incidentally involved, not directly aimed at in her acts—it concerned all Christendom.

Let us now see how far Italian publicists took this view of the event.

The *Italie*, in the article to which reference has already been made, as early as September 6th, said, in speaking of the fall of the *temporal power* :—

"In presence of this grand event, the question of Rome, the capital, loses for an instant its importance. We also have wished that Rome should be the capital of Italy; but what matters the transfer of the bureaux of the Government from one city to another? \* \* \* \* If the fall of the temporal power is only regarded from the point of view of Italian interests, it would belittle the question. This event is destined to have an enormous in-

fluence upon all Catholicism, and especially upon the Latin peoples, upon those who have lived to the present time under the domination of prejudices the most opposed to the ideas of liberty and which the court of Rome has exerted itself to maintain by every means."

Again the *Nazione* says, upon the 19th inst. :—

"The politicians of the opposition have never considered the Roman question as it really is; they have always viewed it partially, as a matter of Italian interest only; and they have ever fallen into the error of considering, as principal, that which is secondary."

Even more explicit was the language of the same journal on the 17th in a leading article upon "*The Roman Question* :"—

"The completed nationality (of Italy) having been thus attained we shall find ourselves at once in the presence of the intricate problem of the coexistence of a free nation with the independent Papacy. The Roman question, we shall never sufficiently repeat it, rises before us entire and intact and more urgent than ever, the day we enter Rome. And more urgent and more unavoidable we have ourselves rendered it, inasmuch as we have stripped it of the heterogeneous elements in which the temporal power had enwrapped and confused it, giving to it false appearances, and surrounding it with interests entirely foreign to its essential character.

Let us go a step further, and see what issues appear to such writers as these to be involved in this Roman question, now that it has been thus disentangled from Italian politics and from all considerations growing out of the temporal power, and revealed in its purely ecclesiastical character :—

"The temporal power having fallen," says the *Ralie*, "the Church herself will undergo insensibly a transformation, and will end, it is to be hoped, by identifying herself with progress and with human society."

Again :—

"We enter there," says the *Nazione*, "in the name of the great principles of civilization and modern progress (the very principles that is, which have just been solemnly condemned by a Papacy claiming infallibility, under penalty of eternal damnation) and our undertaking, instead of being useful to the world and glorious to us, would be ignominious to us and fatal to the world, if, not preserving due measure, we should, for the sake of concord with the Pope, abjure those principles which are the foundations of modern civilization; those liberties which are the reason of our existence as a nation."

And again, in connection with what has been quoted above of the comparative importance of the question of the Italian Capital, the same journal adds :—



"But to set forth to put an end to that worldly institution which has adulterated the Church and which, from the middle ages down, has ever disturbed the world, is to make a *crusade* in the name of civilization, and in which Italy, more than herself, represents humanity and whatever is noble and elevated in human thought."

Now, these two journals are perhaps the most able and enlightened and are certainly among the most influential of Florence, or, indeed, of Italy. These extracts prove that *they* are able to look upon the question of the day from the standpoint of a more enlarged statesmanship; and from such language as the above we may, therefore, form some estimate of the spirit with which Italian statesmanship is likely to deal with the *questione Romana* in its new phase, or rather with the true *questione Romana*, which the occupation of Rome has not solved, but only brought up for solution.

We rise now from the sphere of local politics into the wider and nobler atmosphere of *œcumenical* statesmanship, and in so doing, we see that just as the passions and aims of the people of Italy were made subservient to the political and constitutional aims of the Italian Government, so these latter have, by the occupation of Rome, prepared the field for a more far-reaching human statesmanship; and more, subserved the all-wise and, as yet, only partially revealed Providence of God.

For the final overthrow of the temporal power of the Popes, which, though *not the direct object*, was indirectly but necessarily involved in the events which have been just described, was the consequence, not of the policy of the Italian Cabinet alone, but of the due combination with this policy of the Vatican Council and of the Franco-Prussian War.

More than all others the Pope himself contributed to bring about his own overthrow. A year ago he would probably have found defenders among the peoples who were still devoted to him; Austria, at least, bound by the Concordat, might perhaps have felt compelled to interfere in his defence. But the dogma of the personal infallibility, including as it did, and as it was frankly declared that it must do, such extreme claims as those of the Bull *Unam Sanctam*, and making the most reactionary principles of the Syllabus of 1864 *de fide*—both to be received and admitted *ex animo* under pain of everlasting damnation—was a formal declara-

tion of war *à l'outrance*, on the part of the Roman Papacy, against the fundamental principles of constitutional government. It inflicted a rude shock upon the devotion of the more intelligent and influential Roman Catholics throughout Europe, and forced Roman Catholic Governments, in simple self-defence, into hostility. Austria renounced her Concordat; and in the hour of the extreme peril of the Papacy, Monsignore Nardi went, with unblushing effrontery, from one of these thus defied governments to another, pleading in vain that some arm should be interposed to save it.

Rome, then, has fallen; the temporal power has been swept away, and the spiritual power of the Pope has been deprived of all its outer bulwarks, *in direct consequence* of the blasphemous decree which the Papacy forced the Vatican Council to pronounce.

"The Pope," says the *Nazione* of Florence, "usurping in himself the authority of the Episcopate, concentrating in himself all the authority of the Church, and by the dogma of infallibility placing himself above every interest and every earthly power, aroused against himself those very religious interests which were heretofore called to defend him, and threatened civil society and the lay power in their most vital parts."

"To infallibility," says the *Neue Freie Presse* of Vienna, "succeeds overthrow; to the Œcumenical Council succeeds the entry of the Italian troops in the States of the Church. Events develop themselves with irresistible logic."

We thus come in full sight of the Providence of God. No human foresight, no human wisdom planned the great combination of the party strife and the national aims of Italian politicians, the Vatican Council, and the Franco-German war. No human hand restrained the warlike purposes of Paris and Berlin, permitting French and German Bishops to sit side by side and a French army to protect them, *until* the measure of Rome's iniquity was full and the step taken which should at last release the nations from their servitude, and the nobler Christians of the Roman Catholic Church from their blind subserviency. No human power, when this was done, instantly let loose a fearful war, which, among God's other inscrutable purposes, dissolved the Council and opened to Italy the gates of Rome. No human policy designed for the republican party their part in this combination. No human statesmanship now keeps apart French and German Bishops, and distracts public attention, until Italy's own part in preparing the way for the future shall have been accomplished. The Providence

of God has alone foreseen—has alone timed—has alone combined all these several agencies which have united so marvelously, as soon as Rome had taken the last fatal step, to strip her of the temporal power and place the spiritual Papacy itself on trial before Christendom. The infatuation of the Pope and the mad ambition of the Curia Romana, the strife of parties which raged around the Tuileries, the mutual distrust and jealousies of two great peoples, the intrigues of revolutionists, the shock of arms, and the self-protecting policy of the Italian Cabinet and the European powers, all, all have utilized and combined by an overruling Providence, which has been almost equally ignored by all those whom He has made His own instrumentalities.

The 20th of September, 1870, therefore, while it *solved* the Roman question in its merely popular or local aspect, while it, for the time being at all events, saved the principles of European constitutional monarchy from a threatened assault of red republicanism, only *revealed* more clearly, divested of all side issues, the true *Roman Question* of the age, which concerns not Italy alone, not European monarchies alone, but every free and enlightened nation in the world, to the extent that Roman Catholics are found within it. The question may be formulated thus: "How can a religious system, which condemns all the essential and fundamental principles of liberal governments, which claims the right to set human laws at naught and to withhold obedience from all constituted authorities at pleasure, and which exacts submission *ex animo* to these claims under penalty of eternal damnation, be reconciled with a free government which maintains that freedom of conscience in religion, is one of the dearest rights of a free people?"

Nothing remains now but to fulfill the work thus begun; to solve the question thus formulated. For a longer or a shorter period *statesmen* may seek for a solution; but it will be in vain. To them will be assigned the task of proving that the Papacy cannot be reconciled with free institutions or with the truest interests of modern society. To others, the holier work of demonstrating that neither can it be reconciled with the Word of God or with the purity of His Holy Catholic Church.

For this last and crowning work He has in reserve His Hefèlès, and Swarzenburgs, Darboys and Kendricks, His Döllingers, Gratrays, and Hyacinthes, and others who will yet come forth in the fullness of His own appointed time.

## ART. III.—DOCTOR CRAIK AND HIS REVIEWER.

In some respects, these two learned men differ only, in the terms employed, while in fact they mean to teach the same truths in regard to the Divine Life and the New Birth; but in other respects, their difference is essential and radical.

In the Reviewer's opening sentence, page 198, there is a serious omission, which, as it stands, makes the sentence untrue, but supplied it enunciates an accepted verity—"The *promised* Incarnation of the Son of God for the redemption of fallen man was the *beginning* of that great work of salvation, which he came to accomplish for our race." And the simple omission of this adjective has seemed to modify, to the same degree, truth in the whole of his Article. It affects premise and argument alike. This will appear as we get forward in the consideration of the more vital questions involved.

Page 203. Dr. Craik nowhere asserts that "men in their fallen condition are incapable of receiving the grace of God." On the contrary, he teaches that this grace has been communicated to all men, and so incorporated with their nature, by virtue of the Incarnation, that they may, by the use of those sufficient means of grace secured by the New Birth, bring forth the fruit of holiness." Nor has he indicated that "there is no residuum of a spiritual nature in man to whom the Spirit of God can join Himself." On the contrary, he affirms that the Spirit of God has "joined Himself" to the spiritual nature in man, and he adopts unreservedly the Reviewer's consequence, "and so by His grace, led men, themselves willingly following, to the reception of the Divine Life provided for them in Christ." We would say rather to the *conscious* reception, and *obedient* following of the Divine Life.

The only difference here between Dr. Craik and his Reviewer is, that the former calls this junction of the Spirit of God with the spirit of man, leading him to holy obedience, *the Divine Life in the soul*, and Dr. Buel rejects that *nomenclature*. Both affirm the same truth and simply differ about the *name* by which it should be expressed. The whole question then between them is, as in so many other differences, a mere "*war of words*." This identity of

view and diversity of expression is still more apparent elsewhere in the Article. As on page 211, where the Reviewer seems emphatically to affirm as his own belief "the universal gift, through Christ, of the spirit of life and light to operate upon depraved humanity," and at the same time denies that this is "the Divine Life in the soul of man." Now, as the Reviewer here states, Dr. Craik uniformly confounds these two things, and means by the Divine Life nothing more than the belief of the Reviewer—"the universal gift!" The dispute, therefore, is simply and purely about words! Dr. Craik demonstrated the same thing, when his book was much more harshly condemned by the Evangelicals. Whether this terminology is most appropriate, and better accords with a consistent body of Christian Theology, must be, for the Church hereafter to determine. It seems that the objection to it has come simply from the long prevalence of that Calvinistic system which maintained that the life of God was only imparted to those elect for whom alone it was destined, and in whom alone it is indestructible. Those who repudiate this dogma and all who reject the pseudogospels described by Dr. Craik, whether so-called Evangelicals or Churchmen, do virtually agree with him. The popular use in the Bible and in Christian writers, of the term Divine Life to express the practical living in accordance with that life—the actual following of Christ—does not militate against the scientific use of the term in its strict sense in systematic theology. It is like St. Paul's saying, "As many as are led by the spirit of God, they are the Sons of God." But the Bible, the Church, and our Reviewer affirm that all who are born again in Baptism are certainly "the sons of God." St. Paul here virtually affirms that unless they continue to be led by the Spirit of God, they are not the sons of God. No contradiction exists here. One proposition is a theological verity; the other, a practical test of holy living.

Nearly all the objectors to that view of the effect of the Incarnation upon human nature, set forth in this work, dwell much upon an imagined consequence of the fall, while it seems to us our author has faithfully employed the language of the Church and of the Bible in describing that portentous part in the history of man.

The Reviewer, as a writer in the *Protestant Churchman* had done before him, draws this extraordinary and gratuitous conclusion. He says:—"In a being in such a condition as described by

Dr. Craik there would be no place of entertainment for the Divine Spirit." It "would remove him as far from the possibility of Salvation, as if he were a beast, a stock, or a stone." See pages 203-4.

Again on page 213, he says: "on this view, it is hard to see what else human nature would be, but a mere unspiritual scene of action, in which the spirit of God alone enacts and produces the semblance of human virtue."

We have never been able to comprehend the force or meaning of these representations. We are not sufficiently acquainted with the essence of the human soul, or with the limits of the vivifying power of the Divine Spirit, to affirm, that human nature can be beyond the reach of influence—co-operating influence—from the Spirit. Certainly the Scriptures do not encourage us to set limits to the Spirit's power. A prophet once inquired, "Can these dry bones live?" And Jesus Himself said: "If these should hold their peace, the very stones would cry out."

It does not seem to us that Dr. Craik has even gone beyond the language of the Scriptures and the Church in describing the effect of the fall. He has simply affirmed, with the Scriptures and the Church, that to make this fallen creature capable of loving and doing good, of loving and seeking after God, the Spirit of God must move upon his heart, quicken his nature, and lead him, not by mechanical force upon brute nature, but by co-operation in and with the human faculties back to original righteousness, upward to God. The objection, therefore, to this view of the Divine operations, founded upon any supposable or imagined state of human nature, is to us unintelligible.

That the Revelation makes the Church and its ministrations the way of Salvation, is but the synonym of the fact, that the Church is a part of the Revelation, and that all to whom the Revelation comes, must accept this appointed way. But there is a world-wide field of phenomena outside of the Revelation which cannot be overlooked. The Revelation does not distinctly treat of these phenomena, nor does it state formally the being of God, or the immortality of the soul. It assumes these and many other verities, as the basis of its positive teaching. The work before us has simply formulated some of these all-pervading phenomena, which the human soul cannot ignore, and exhibited their relation to the



kingdom of God, and to the Revelation establishing that kingdom. And this has been done upon the very principles abundantly supplied by the Revelation itself. A scientific basis is thus presented for positive teachings.

To require that the Revelation shall be always nakedly presented to the minds of men, apart from the universal truths which itself assumes and recognizes, as a mere arbitrary and technical system, is to deal unfairly with the Gospel—is to put it out of relation with the thoughts, and hopes, and affections of men, and with the better spirit of the age in which we live. If the ministers of this Divine truth are determined thus to present it in severe isolation from all accordant truth, as a rigid, technical, and arbitrary system, it will be rejected, as they see, by a large class of the better minds of the world.

This Reviewer admits the phenomena, and devoutly believes in the universal influence of the Spirit of God upon the hearts of men, but earnestly protests against holding or presenting these truths in any sort of relation to Christianity, and insists, that men shall be forced to receive this Christianity, not as a component part of the beautiful harmony of the universe, but as an isolated fact unconnected with any other truth. Not so was the Revelation given. It was given to men with mind and capacity to see, and consider, and entertain all the phenomena of intelligent life, and character, and condition, presented in the world's history. And it contains the principles large, liberal, and pervading, by which its own special truths may be rationally connected with these universal phenomena of human character and destiny.

The reaction from this stern, narrow, and technical theology, has produced that wide-spread humanitarianism which is so painfully affecting the Christian faith. Because this theology contravenes and denies the plainest facts of observation and consciousness, men renounce the Christianity so presented, and undertake to build up another one-sided system out of these mere facts of observation and consciousness, disregarding revelation altogether. The work before us points out the Christian way of terminating this miserable conflict, by reconciling these universal facts with Christian dogma, and clearly exhibiting the relation between these facts and the supernatural revelation—the kingdom of God.

Our author, however, has written, unconsciously to himself, and



unfortunately for us, for another generation. His work is too consistent with itself, and too thoroughly in harmony with the truth, wherever found, not to meet with resistance from those long entrenched in the old terminologies of theological learning. But his grand and consistent presentation of Christian doctrine will live. No one can attentively peruse the work without discovering that it was not the intuitional inspiration of a month's labor, but was the gradual outgrowth of many years of careful investigation and profound thought.

But to return to more specific criticism :

In our first paragraph it was said that in some respects Dr. Craik and his Reviewer differ essentially and radically.

The former, for example, declares unequivocally that God did execute the penalty, "in the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." On page 78 of his work, it is affirmed that this death was complete, in that it separated the offenders from their Maker—all guarantee of life here and hereafter was withdrawn—that, symbolic of that dissolution of the relation between them, the wretched twain were driven from the place of their communion with God, and flaming swords guarded the way to the tree of Life.

But whilst the dissolution was complete in itself, yet, in that same day, God restored through His promised Seed, enough of His Divine Image to Adam, to enable him and his posterity "to seek after God, if haply they might find Him." This restored capacity Dr. Craik calls the Divine Life, and the same coupled with Adam's fallen, depraved nature, St. John declares to be "the life" that was "the light of man," the light that "shineth in darkness and the darkness comprehendeth it not."

The latter, however, intimates that the death penalty was not fully executed ; that man became only bent from his legitimate course ; that his faculties became warped, or diseased ; and that his being, "very far from original righteousness" as defined in our Article, means that, and nothing else ; and that the "residuum" of the Divine Image still remains as a ground-work on which the Spirit of God, in Jesus Christ, may build a super-structure, beautiful and god-like.

This "*quam longissime*" of our Article is simply intended to represent the condition of man as he stands in his naked naturalness, without going within the veil of his nature to analyze, under

the light of Revelation, what *it is* in him, that makes him only "very far gone from original righteousness," when the Divine decree of his death unto God had never been abrogated.

Dr. Craik, as a Christian philosopher, penetrated that veil, and under the light of God's word, discovered the phrase "very far gone from original righteousness," simply to imply that man's deadness in the first Adam was vivified by being coupled with a divine and living principle, imparted from the second through the promised Seed of the Woman; but as this light "shineth in darkness and the darkness comprehendeth it not," there could be no possible expression more nearly in accord with the status of human nature unrenewed and unsanctified, than the "*quam longissime*" of our 9th Article.

Dr. Craik gives a distinct, clear, and positive character to this "residuum" of the Divine Image, and calls it a Divine Life—a germ implanted by virtue of the Incarnation of the second Adam, that exists in *every* soul, giving to each the influence of its co-existence with the evil nature, as far as natural obstructions or spiritual darkness may allow; and that as the soul yields itself to provisions of Salvation through Christ, these obstructions giving way, and the darkness dispersing, the Divine Life will grow up to the full measure of the stature of Christ.

His Reviewer, on the other hand, seems to have a most confused idea of this "residuum." He believes there must be something of the sort with which the Spirit of Grace may "join Himself;" but whether it be the remains of the unfallen, un sinful Adam, and thereby a failure on God's part to execute, that far, the death penalty; or whether it be some sort of spiritual receptivity imparted to endue man with capacity for receiving the Divine Life subsequent thereto he does not inform us. If he means the former, he reckons without authority. There is no intimation whatever of a failure on God's part to execute the death penalty, according to the decree, absolutely and entirely. On the other hand, Adam's shamefacedness—his lying apology—his utter banishment, all show plainly enough that the relationship between the created and the Creator was effectually and absolutely dissolved. If he means the latter, he could hardly explain to us from the Scriptures the nature and consistency of the Divine receptivity imparted by the

Spirit of Grace, without unconsciously falling into the very same groove of thought so admirably pursued in Dr. Craik's book.

The fact is, this receptivity is what Dr. C. properly calls the "Divine Life." *It is a life.* It is no passive thing, susceptible of *receiving only*; but it has an active, energetic existence, one that wrestles with the evil while co-existent with it, and even though at times prostrated and helpless as a worm beneath the heel of a giant, it still writhes, ere its life goes out, and the man becomes a fiend or devil.

In regard to the New Birth, Dr. Craik confines it, as does our Reviewer, to Baptism. The former, however, makes Baptism the sacramental doorway of a life already existing unto the kingdom of God—there to find appliances suited to its growth and perfection for the Master's use. The latter makes Baptism not a doorway, but the act of fecundation, as it were, of the Holy Ghost, and the Consecrated Water, and the Divine Life in embryo, begins *only then*; and its development is subsequently promoted as in the former case. If such were the fact, our Lord would have used the word "fecundation" and not "born," in the formulary He proposed to Nicodemus. There would be no such thing as "a new birth unto righteousness," or the being "born of water and of the Spirit." It would be an utter misapplication of language. All this, however, will appear in clearer light, as we progress with a more systematic presentation of the scientific and logical arrangement found on the work of our learned author.

Two huge systems of error in regard to the Divine Life, and to the New Birth, pervade the religious world. Their fundamental character is identical; but in their development, they diverge as far apart as it is possible.

One system teaches that the Divine Life in the soul begins with conversion, and that conversion and regeneration are the same, and that therefore conversion is the beginning of the Divine Life, and before *non erat*.

The other system is that which is known as the *opus operatum* of the Roman Church, teaching that the administration of Baptism by the act itself dates the beginning of the new life—that there was a time anterior to this sacrament, in adult or infant, when there was no divine life in the soul—nothing of God's image to be found!

Our Reviewer, however, does not claim any virtue, like the Romanist, for the bare rite of Baptism, apart from repentance and faith. But like him, he places the beginning of the Divine Life at the *font*; and, therefore, whatever may invalidate the dogmatic teaching of the one, must likewise impair that of the other.

The objections to these two systems—the popular theology as to conversion, and the Roman dogma as to regeneration—so far as the fundamental principle goes, are the same, and they both must stand or fall together.

Among the passages of Scripture that seem to teach depravity uncoupled with any co-existent and divine principle, and, therefore, to license the systems we are animadverting upon, are such as these: "Behold I was shapen in iniquity and in sin did my mother conceive me. The whole head is sick and the whole heart is faint." "Every imagination of the thoughts of the heart is only evil continually." Perhaps these are as strong passages as may be found that look to total depravity as the soul's condition before that point of conversion or baptism which is claimed as the beginning of the Divine Life, and yet they are not sufficient, in opposition to *all observation and experience* to settle the question. Indeed, it is not difficult to employ such strong affirmations when speaking of man's unrenewed and unsanctified condition, while the doctrine of the Divine Life as taught by our author is taken for granted. Although we are conceived in sin and born in iniquity, yet, as the finest diamond may be embedded in the foulest earth, so the image of God—the Divine Life, imparted to the First Adam by virtue of the promised Incarnation of the second, and imparted to his posterity by virtue of the actual Incarnation of the Lord of Glory, may be hidden in the transmission from father to son, though corrupt human nature may overlie it, and be wrapt about it! As to other passages, they are simply strongly expressive of our ruined state—its utter proneness to evil, but without implying that the Divine Image is utterly wanting, or that no germ of a holier life remains somewhere and somehow hidden in the soul's dark depths.

The Scripture, however, that bears directly upon the Divine Life as co-existent with corrupt human nature, is full and pointed.

At the risk of being tedious, a repetition of illustration seems necessary to the argument.

We hold that God did faithfully fulfill His word and execute the death penalty upon Adam and Eve. On the day of disobedience all guarantee of life was withdrawn—soul and body were subjected at once to decay and death—the soul destined to the death of the fallen angels—a forfeiture of all God's blessed image—the body was destined to dissolution, to be restored no more forever. And had there been no redeeming power provided then, the lapse would have been utter and irretrievable ruin, and no tracings of the Divine Life or Image could have been discovered in soul or body. But a Redeemer had been provided before the world was. It is written "the Lamb of God was slain *before* the foundation of the world." And Jesus Himself said, "*before* Abraham was I AM." And St. John declared that "in the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. In Him was Life, and the Life was the light of men." And in the very words of the curse, this great fact of Christ's eternal sonship as the world's redeeming power before the fall, was, that He existed, as it were, *anticipatory of that fatal event*. In the curse, God said to the serpent, "I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed—it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise its heel." Now it is clear that the Seed of the Woman was none other than Christ, the Lord, co-eternal with the Father, and co-equal in the Godhead, yet to accomplish the high ends of God's moral universe, in the fullness of time, He has to be born of a woman, and manifest in the flesh.

| The enmity that was to, and actually does subsist between, the devil and all his works and agencies, on the one hand, and Christ, the Seed of the Woman, and all His Divine and holy adjuncts, on the other, is a fact as clear as the sun.

The struggle between right and wrong—purity and impurity—honor and shame, virtue and vice, is the history of the race. The individual as well as the national life of all Adam's descendants might testify to this fact as indisputable.

The Apostle recognizes the same fact when speaking of the Gentiles as being a law unto themselves:

"For when the Gentiles," saith he, "which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not law, are a law unto themselves, which show the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and

their thoughts the meanwhile accusing or else excusing one another."

These words were said of the heathen utterly beyond the pale of Christian influence. The same principles apply, of course, to all heathen, similarly situated—those who have never known, and will never know the gospel, nor anything as to Christian baptism or conversion. The struggle here is clearly drawn by St. Paul as between the flesh and the spirit—the natural man, and the Divine Life co-existent along with the carnal nature."

But our Reviewer, page 212, intimates that conscience is a *natural power*; and that it was so exercised by the heathen in the passage above quoted. And so is any other moral quality a natural power; but were it not united to that quickening Life imparted to all men, there would be no law written on the heathen's heart by the finger of God. The fact of a heathen or any other man, having a conscience sensitive to wrong-doing and appreciative of right, is enough to show that it is the work of God's grace—that it is the Divine Life bursting, its embryo hiding-place, and developing and asserting for itself a higher, nobler existence! And how beautifully does all this harmonize with St. Paul's affirmation, that "as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." "The first man Adam was made a living soul; the last Adam was made a quickening spirit."

Divine Life is the purchase of "the Lamb that was slain before the foundation of the world." Divine Life, through the last Adam, who "was made a quickening spirit," has been quickened along with the natural foetus in every womb; and every child born into the world has, by virtue of Christ's Incarnation, in its soul and body, the germ of an immortal nature.

The Apostle, in writing to his converts, deals in axiomatic truths, but in applying them to the heart-struggles in the experience of his Christian disciples, he by no means gives us to understand that he regards them as limited only to such cases. The fact is, he employed them as truisms, familiar to the universal consciousness of men. He speaks of "the spirit warring against the flesh, and the flesh against the spirit." He declares also that "there is a law in our members warring against the law of the mind"—that "when we would do good, evil is present with us."

Now, whence comes this conflict—this perpetual soul-struggle?



It is clear the character of the two is as opposite as light and darkness, and that they are utterly irreconcilable antagonists—one is divine; the other unholy—one God-like; the other Devil-like, both within the same breast, and both peculiar to every soul that has come into the world. Whence came they? There is no dispute as to the source of the evil-force; but whence the good one? Is it a mere passive fragment of the Divine Image left in the general rubbish and ruin of man's fall? But it is *not passive*—it is an intense *activity*. It must, therefore, be that there is coupled with man's corrupt nature, and in conflict with it, a divine energy—a moral force, God-given—a divine life co-eval with the soul itself, quickened by the second Adam who “was made a quickening spirit”—a spirit that was before Abraham—that existed in the “Seed” of the first prophecy, that became the life-restoring and life-giving power to the soul.

This Divine Life is the hidden leaven to soul and body. Under the Holy Ghost it warms into an active, soul-energizing principle, that may permeate and pervade the whole man. It is this that may give the soul an immortality of peace:

“The soul, of origin divine  
God's glorious image—freed from clay,  
In Heaven's eternal sphere shall shine,  
A star of day.”

It is the Divine Life given unto men, by virtue of the Incarnation of Jesus Christ, which guarantees the resurrection of the body. And this line of argument, St. Paul has grandly developed, in his 15th Chapter of First Corinthians.

We cannot close this scriptural argument, however, without an illustration from one class of our Lord's miracles—the cure of lepers. It is patent to all Bible readers that the leper was ever taken as a fit illustration of sin, and its dire effects. The leper who came to Jesus, crying, “Lord, if Thou wilt, Thou canst make me clean,” was in the last stages of dreadful disease. It is said the blessed Lord put forth his hand and touched him, and he was healed.

There was that leper—a mere mass of corruption, but within him was his natural life, still pulsating with energy, and the blood, however corrupt, still coursed its paths through the arterial



system! His life-stamina were undestroyed; there was that left in him, on which the healing power of Christ might work. All was corrupt but *that*—dead but *that*. A living principle was in union with that putrid body; and on that, the Divine Physician wrought out the perfect cure of the whole man. So is it spiritually. Although the heart may be corrupt, and desperately wicked—there is a divine life in every soul, and with this, the Holy Ghost-applying the blood of Christ, may afford healing virtue to the whole man.

One more scriptural illustration strangely misapplied by our learned Reviewer, on page 205. "*To as many as received Him, gave He power to become the Sons of God.*" Because this passage of holy writ is from the pen of "the disciple who spoke from the bosom of the Lord Himself," our Reviewer gives it especial credence, and dwells upon it, as an unanswerable objection against Doctor Craik's view of the Divine Life. Now, it is clear, one or the other of us utterly mis-construes these apostolic words. Had our Reviewer not used them for his own purposes, it is not unlikely that the present writer would have selected them, in order to substantiate the portions of his author. Be that as it may, we must insist upon the introductory clause, "*to as many as received Him,*" to mean nothing else than that all men had some sort of power residing in them to receive the Son of God. You would not consider a friend accountable for refusing to hold out his hand for a gift when his body was armless, nor could he accept a gift, however perfect his limbs, unless he possessed some sort of inherent power to move the muscles of his hand. "*To as many as received Him*" therefore implies the Divine Life in man—that Divine capacity which can distinguish and choose the good from the evil; and "to them who are exercised thereby," does God give the "power"—that is, the privilege—the immunity—to become the Sons of God in Baptism—"members of Christ, children of God and inheritors of the Kingdom of Heaven."

To conclude the argument for the Divine Life as co-existent with corrupt nature, we might array a number of passages from the early Christian writers, to show that the doctrine is not only scriptural but catholic. Dr. Craik has given two or three admirable quotations from Justin Martyr, Tertullian and Clemens Alexandrinus. See pages 169-70. It must suffice here to observe that

while there may not be found any such terminology as the "Divine Life" in the sense used by our Author, in the ancient testimonies, yet, the same principle is abundantly taught, not formulated under any specific nomenclature, and the same idea prevails with scarcely an exception. See Weckham's celebrated "Synopsis of baptism, regeneration, conversion, &c., and other kindred subjects in the original tongues by the fathers and other writers from the time of our Saviour to the end of the fourth century."

We come now to consider conversion in its relation to the Divine Life.

Conversion is the turning of a man's life-character to God.

It may be undisputably held, from what has gone before, that it were impossible for a man to turn unto the Lord, had he no capacity anteriorly existing so to do, any more than he could turn his body into a path of safety without inherent powers of locomotion. This capacity to turn unto the Lord may be quickened by God's Spirit operating directly, or through Providence, or through the appointed means of calling sinners to repentance, and thus, as it were, affording stimuli to the Divine Life, the better to enable the soul, aroused to its duty, to turn away from sin, and be renewed in the spirit of the mind.

But the Divine Life does exist in a man's soul to do many good and blessed things, and yet the man may be unturned—unconverted to God. A precious gem though hidden in the rubbish, may reveal here and there an angle, flashing in the sunlight. Some men seem to have been born better than others, or in other words, some have the divine life in a degree more manifest than it exists in others; and yet in neither one nor the other class, is it of any avail, unless it "bears fruit unto holiness." The talent tied in the napkin brought only condemnation to its owner; but to him whose talents had multiplied—had "brought forth fruit"—to him was salvation come.

"All have sinned and come short of the glory of God," is a divine truism which no example in actual life, however praiseworthy, can annul or disprove. It must needs be, therefore, that as many as are called must come to Christ, *actually* renouncing the devil and his works, the pomps and vanities of this wicked world and all the deceitful lusts of the flesh. *And this is conversion.* It may be in one man, more absolute and visible than in another; but, be

it less or more, whether vice or virtue, has predominated in his previous life—the whole man is to be turned—converted to God in his life-character, to which he but gives outward expression in the vow of renunciation at *his Baptism*.

By this we may rightly infer that conversion is one thing—the new birth in baptism another.

A man baptized in his infancy, and wandering in forbidden paths, must repent and turn to God, as the prodigal to his father's home. He must be converted, and become again as a little child else he can never see his Lord in peace.

An unbaptized man, but one who is aroused to his duty, and longs to become "a member of Christ, a child of God, and an inheritor of the Kingdom of Heaven," and who has resolved "to lead a new life, following the commandments of God," may be, and is a truly converted man, but he is still unborn into Christ's blessed Kingdom; and before his conversion can avail for him any lasting good in the economy of grace, he must be born again; "for except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter the Kingdom of God."

Nicodemus was just such a character; converted from the error of his way, he sought the Master eagerly, and earnestly inquired how he might become one of His followers, a member of His society, a subject of His Kingdom. But devoted and converted as he was, the Master answered him, "Ye must be born again!" And in further explanation of it, He set forth a universal rule for him and all others who would enter His Kingdom on earth and in Heaven—"Except a man be born of water, and of the Spirit, he cannot enter the Kingdom of God."

This Baptism "of water and of the Spirit" is the only introduction, therefore, into Christ's Kingdom: and our Lord called it the being "born again," and St. Paul "the washing of regeneration."

Now, what is the relation of this new birth to the Divine Life? Why the need of Baptism if a Divine Life existed in the soul before? For the same reason that physical birth is necessary to the antenatal life in the mother's womb. Life is there perfect in itself, but unborn of the flesh, it can never develop in rational being to the stature of manhood. It requires another sphere of existence—one of space, and light, and air; and such hath nature's

God provided: and the introduction into that sphere is by physical birth.

In like manner, the Divine Life requires for its perfect development, a new, higher and holier sphere. It requires, however much it may have been quickened into a more energetic existence, intimate fellowship with Christ, membership in His society, citizenship in His commonwealth—called *Εκκλησία Θεοῦ*—in which His Spirit reigns as He does not in the world, to sanctify and invigorate even the Divine Life, through offices, ordinances, sacraments, and services, that the Life may grow up to the fullness of the stature of Christ.

That we may have a clearer understanding of this doctrine of baptismal regeneration, we will briefly consider the two offices with which Baptism is invested.

These offices are, *first*, the remission of sins, and *secondly*, the guarantee to the subject, of all the privileges and benefits in the Kingdom of Grace.

In regard to remission of sins by any formal or priestly act, or sacrament, the popular theology has created such a prejudice in the minds of many persons, even in the Church, that, losing sight of *article and creed*, they openly express their dissent. It does not occur to them, that if a temporal power may determine a formal act, and appoint a fitting occasion for the reprieve, or the pardon of an offender, surely God's ability, willingness, or preference to remit sin at a time and under circumstances of His own arrangement, ought not to be called in question. This office in Baptism is *His* plan for the authoritative remission of sin, and not man's. It is ours to accept His Word and will. The formulary of salvation in Christ was annunciated through the inspired lips of St. Peter on the day of Pentecost—"Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins." Repentance, another name here for conversion, must ever *precede* the grant of forgiveness, else Baptism becomes a birth of the water, but not of the Spirit—an empty ceremonial!

But to the penitent and contrite heart, God hath appointed a time and circumstance when in a formal, significant, and sacramental manner, He proposes to grant "remission of sins."

A converted and penitent man may enjoy God's loving favor, who has a desire to enter His Kingdom by formal remission of sin,

but who lacks the opportunity. A pardoned outlaw who has laid down his arms under an amnesty-proclamation, enjoys the blessings and protection of the kingdom, to a certain extent, though the opportunity may not have been afforded him to seal his repentance in an oath of allegiance, and to receive in return his acquittal duly signed and sealed by proper authority.

A body of land may have been purchased and paid for, and may be occupied without the title passing in due form into the hands of the purchaser. But the privileges and the benefits of the land, to a certain extent, are not denied the purchaser, though the title deed be not yet in his own name. But in the eye of the law the outlaw is still unpardoned, and the occupant still an alien in his own home, until the authoritative and formal acts in both cases, make the acquittal of the one complete, and the ownership of the other an unquestioned fact.

We adduce these familiar illustrations to afford a clearer understanding of the character and importance of Baptism as an authoritative act for the forgiveness of sin, original and actual.

And in conformity with this, we have not only the answer of St. Peter to the multitude pricked to the heart, but we have, subsequently, the case of Saul of Tarsus, precisely in accord with St. Peter's formulary of salvation. He was a repentant and converted man for three days at Damascus, before he was born of "water and of the Spirit." Ananias said to him while still on his knees in prayer, "Brother Saul, arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins!" It was not until after his Baptism that he began to preach Christ unto the people. This was that divine and formal acquittal of the criminal Saul that enabled him to go forth in "the liberty wherewithal Christ had made him free." And thus it is, we declare in our Creed—"I acknowledge one Baptism for the remission of sins."

How close does the analogy of the new birth in Baptism bear to the old birth in nature! As the new born child is washed from its defilements, that it may be fitted for the growth and development of the natural man, so does God in the new birth in Baptism, symbolically and outwardly by water, and really and inwardly by the Holy Ghost, *applying Christ's blood* "wash away" our sins. In infancy, God's Spirit under the symbol of water, remits original sin—in adult age, under the symbol of water, (if repentance and

faith precede the sacrament) God's Holy Spirit, *applying Christ's blood*, remits both original and actual transgression. As before intimated, as the new born child requires cleansing for health and growth, so does the child of grace, need "*the washing of regeneration*," that in the Kingdom of God he may grow up a perfect man in Christ Jesus, our Lord.

As the natural man is subject to perpetual bodily defilement, and needs the labor of cleansing with which from time to time, to purify the outer man, so hath God ordained, knowing the frailties of his children, that there be ever recurring means by which the actual and repeated sins of His people may be remitted. And these ordinances of re-iterated remission, are confirmation, priestly absolution, and the oft-repeated sacrament of the Lord's Supper, whereby we obtain, by virtue of Christ's blood, "remission of our sins" and "other benefits of His Passion."

Let it be distinctly noted that in the illustrations drawn from the physical birth for the spiritual, we have simply amplified legitimately and naturally, the favorite simile employed by our blessed Lord with which he would teach us the way and manner of entering His Kingdom.

Inadvertently, we have already encroached upon the limits of the second office, with which the new birth in Baptism is invested—viz.: the guarantee of the privileges and benefits of Christ's Kingdom. This is a theme, however, alike limitless and exhaustless.

The whole family of earth and heaven is one: the Church militant and the Church triumphant are separated but by a veil. This is that kingdom so often illustrated by metaphor and parable, and which we enter at our Baptism. The whole is impregnated by God's Holy Spirit, and in the heavenly sphere of it, Jesus sits enthroned as our King Immanuel—God with us in both earth and heaven. Within this realm of light, and love and grace, are not only the ordinances and rites—the Priesthood and the Revealed Word, but within this realm, countless millions of the sainted dead, and the angel host, do dwell, as ministers of God's helping grace, shielding and guiding, warning and comforting—"Sent forth," saith the Apostles, "to minister to them who shall be heirs of salvation."



## ART. IV.—BISHOP RAVENSCROFT.

It is now just forty years since the first Bishop of North Carolina ended his brief Episcopate in death.

Elected in 1823, and consecrated the same year, he entered immediately upon his High Pastoral office, and with a success which, alas for the Church! was of scarcely seven years' duration. His course was like that of the meteor, suddenly—appearing, bright, and soon ending in darkness; but still more resembled that of the sun which sets not until it has first given warmth and fruitfulness to the earth.

The "Memoir" of Bishop Ravenscroft, prefixed to his two volumes of sermons, though written by one of the most finished scholars of the South,\* was necessarily imperfect, from the want of those many little details and private marks of character which more than the most labored biography serve to individualize the man. It is proposed, in this sketch, by one, who more than any other of his clergy was admitted to his confidence, not to say affection, to set forth that great and good Bishop just as he was, or as he appeared to the writer's view, during an intimacy commencing previous to his consecration and ending only at the side of his death-bed.

The name "Ravenscroft" is undoubtedly of German origin. On a visit to a colony of that people in the valley of Virginia, soon after he took orders, he was told by one of their patriarchal men that he did not spell his name rightly; that it should be *Ravenscroft*.

Of the Bishop's parents but little is known. He is said to have borne a strong resemblance to his mother, in feature, as well as in the character of his mind. His birth (in 1776) was in the southern portion of the city of Petersburg, Va., for a long time, if not now, known by the name of "Ravenscroft," and once the property of the family. When he was but a few months old his father, in order to avoid the political convulsions then threatening the country, moved back to his former residence in the south of Scotland, and soon afterwards died. Very little is known of the son's boyhood, except

---

\* The late Hon. Walher Anderson, Chief Justice of Florida.



that he lived for some time with an old aunt while attending an excellent classical school in Northumberland. It was while at this school, and in the twelfth year of his age, that he was the subject of one of those strange appearances which can be as little questioned as accounted for. He was playing marbles, with his school-fellows, in the middle of the day, at the side of a hedge. In the midst of the game he distinctly saw his aunt walking towards him on the top of the hedge. After approaching very near to him she suddenly disappeared. Before he could recover from his wonder and alarm a servant of the family rode hastily up to inform him that his aunt, whom he supposed to be in perfect health, had suddenly died. This story the writer received from the Bishop's own lips. Another incident of his boyhood is not without interest, inasmuch as it illustrates that Providence which so kindly preserves our childhood amid dangers both seen and unseen. He was in his ninth year, and playing in front of his mother's dwelling, when a large bull suddenly broke into the yard and ran after him. Before he could reach the house the furious creature overtook him, and getting him between his horns endeavored to gore him first with one, then with the other, until the screams of the child brought the servants to his relief. He added that the prints of those horns were distinctly visible on the side of the house when he left Scotland eight years afterward.

On returning to this country to look after his large estate, he entered "William and Mary College;" but before his graduation he was enticed from his books by the charms of a lady whom he soon after married, and of whom he always spoke in terms of the warmest affection, and of the highest admiration for her piety and many virtues. Being the possessor of a large fortune and of a commanding intellect, he soon became a leading spirit in all the active sports and public amusements which occupied so much of the life of the more wealthy and aristocratic sons of Virginia at that day. Few were more conspicuous than he on the race-course, at the card-table, or around the cock-pit. And he once confessed to the writer, with a heavy sigh, that he had one day gone upon the race-field prepared to horse-whip and, if resisted, to shoot down a fellow-sportsman; a man who afterwards became a distinguished citizen of another State. By the ordering

of a kind Providence his intended victim was that day absent from his usual place, a thing observed by all, and never accounted for. It was not from any sense of fear, for that man was as insensible to such a feeling as Mr. Ravenscroft himself, who could see in it nothing but the preserving and restraining hand of God, extended in mercy to his soul. But the worst practice to which he, with his godless companions, was addicted, was that of profane swearing. In speaking of this, after he became a Bishop, a lady of Petersburg, whose doors were ever open to him, remarked to the writer that, although at that day oaths were in every gentleman's mouth, in the parlor as well as in the street, yet when Mr. Ravenscroft swore she "trembled."

It is with anything but pleasure that these sins of his early life are brought to view. Much as they may shock the pious and sensitive mind of the present day, to no one could the thought of them bring more pain than to himself. The writer well remembers, on first visiting him, and alluding to his great change of life, how his deep-toned voice trembled with emotion as he said: "Forty years, sir, was I an outrageous and outbreking sinner; and it is only by the grace of God that I am what I am."

But painful as it may be to think of those misspent and God-defying years, it is wonderful to see how out of such a course of sin there could be anything extracted that might give increased power to his future ministry. But this he freely acknowledged one day, in the following manner to one of his clergy:

"Brother G., I have one great advantage over you." The answer was, "Not *one* only, Bishop, but a good many."

"Pshaw! no compliments. I mean this, that whereas *you* were brought up in the fear of God, and in ignorance of the great wickedness that is going on in the world, I know all about the sinner's ways, and can therefore track the scoundrels into all their dens and hiding-places, and strip them of their self-deceits and refuges of lies."

When asked how his thoughts were first turned to the subject of religion, he answered that, under God, he owed it to his excellent wife. When, after many weeks of inexcusable absence, he would return home, she would invariably meet him in a gentle and lovely spirit, and make no allusion whatever to his neglect of her, or to the

manner in which his time had been spent. This truly Christian forbearance and sweetness of temper, exhibited again and again, led him, at length, to ask himself, "What can be the cause? Why does not the woman reproach and revile me, as I deserve? This is not *natural*. Where does it come from?" In this way he for some time vainly questioned with himself, while his proud spirit was unwilling to seek the solution from her own lips. He remembered, however, that her daily companion was her Bible, and that he had often surprised her in reading it, when he supposed her to be otherwise engaged. Thinking that he might *there* find the wonder explained, he resolved to become himself a reader of the Scriptures. In that divine mirror he soon saw what a sinner he was, and that his only hope for pardon and salvation lay in a thorough and speedy change of life. Under this imperfect view of his case he resolved that he would, as he expressed it, "try to become a better man, by breaking off first one sin, and then another, until he had made himself a good Christian." Here the writer will use his own words, as well as he can recall them; and he must say that they are, and ever will be, deeply engraved on his memory:

"Knowing that profane swearing was my besetting sin I determined to *take the bull by the horns*, and master that first. Accordingly, by great effort, I kept myself from it, first for a day or two, then for a week or more, and at length for full three weeks. By this time I began to think of taking up another sin, and in like manner, putting it under foot, when one day, being absent from home, under some slight provocation, my old habit returned upon me with a pent-up force, and my oaths were shocking even to myself. Never, in my life, was my pride more humbled and my weakness so plainly set before me. In deep mortification of spirit I hastened home, and, without even speaking to my wife, shut myself within my library, and threw myself upon my face on the bed, in an agony of contending feelings that words cannot describe."

Here he seemed disposed to stop, but being urged to go on, added:

"What passed in that hour I cannot tell you, my good brother, or any other man; but this I will say, that before I left that bed God was pleased, of his abounding mercy, to reveal me to myself, to show me that I had been standing upon the foundation of my own strength, and with my own arm beating down my sins; to convince me what a vain work it was, and to point me to the true and only source of salvation from the guilt as well as the power of my sins. From that hour no oath has ever passed these lips, nor have I felt the least temptation to swear."

Upon being asked why he was so unwilling to disclose what had passed within that hour, he said that what is called the "religious experience" of believers is so widely different that it is unsafe to make one the test of another; and that, occasionally, there is, at the turning point of a man's religious convictions, something so marked and out of the common track, as to make it unwise and even dangerous to publish it, lest others should look for the same in their struggles to renounce the world, and turn to God.

Soon after his change of life became known, it was widely reported that his conversion was brought about by the over-heard prayers of an old negro servant whom he had just cruelly chastised. There was, of course, not a word of truth in this sensational story; but it was nevertheless extensively circulated, and believed at the time, although it was well known to his neighbors and friends that he treated his servants with almost a criminal indulgence.

His residence in Mecklenburg County being remote from any settled place of worship, he was thankful for the occasional visits to the neighborhood of a worthy Minister of the Reformed Methodist denomination, and even accompanied him through several of his appointments, helping him with an occasional exhortation or prayer. Whilst thus zealously engaged, it pleased God to incline him to devote himself wholly to the work of the Ministry. But where should he go? The number of conflicting sects around him was almost as great as at the present day, each claiming to preach a purer Gospel than the rest, and all striving to get him into their ranks. Of the One Apostolic Church of Christ little indeed was then known in Virginia. He had, while at "William and Mary," and during his subsequent married life, learned something of the Protestant Episcopal Church; but, alas! he had learned, only to despise it. This was doubtless owing, in part, to his early Scotch-Presbyterian training; but mainly to the worldly, not to say godless, lives of many both of the clergy and laity of that Church whom he saw around him. It is well known that at the beginning of the present century that Church was at the lowest point of depression. It had yet to show its true character in the lives and labors of such men as Bishops Moore and Meade and the saintly Nicholas Cobbs. When Mr. Ravenscroft, therefore, resolved to

search out for himself an altar at which he might serve, it was with a truly honest mind, and with a firm determination to follow wherever his convictions might lead him; but, as he confessed to the writer, he had a lingering prejudice against the Episcopal Church, and a kind of presentiment that any other would be that of his choice. With the Bible as his chief guide he came out nevertheless from that examination, to use his own words, "as thorough a Churchman" as ever he was afterwards; viz., as firmly rooted in catholic principles, although not so able to defend them. When asked in what parts of the Bible he saw most plainly the distinguishing features of that Church, he answered promptly: "Everywhere, but especially in the Epistles to Timothy and Titus."

After receiving both Deacon's and Priest's Orders at the hands of Bishop Moore, he preached at several small places within the county, and built, principally, with his own means, a plain church about three miles distant from his residence. In this humble sphere he continued to serve for some years, though sought after by several parishes, and invited by Bishop Moore to become his assistant in the Monumental Church in Richmond.

While thus content to labor in one of the obscurest corners of his Master's vineyard he was unexpectedly called to the chief pastorate of the young but important Diocese of North Carolina.

When the Convention of that Diocese met in Salisbury, in April, 1823, to elect their first Bishop, the minds of very few, either of clergy or laity, were centred upon any one individual. That truly godly man, the Rev. Adam Empie D. D., of St. James' Church, Wilmington, was, in a good measure, the favorite of the clergy, but not sufficiently so of the laity. When, as President of the Convention, he announced that the moment had come for entering into the election, there was a pause of some length, and the eyes of several of both clergy and laity were turned on the writer, then the youngest of the clergy, as if expecting him to make a nomination. Having been a pupil of the good President, and allied to him also by family ties, it was truly painful to him to pass by his many claims and propose the name of another. That youthful clergyman had never before spoken in Convention, and was, therefore, startled at the sound of his own voice as he mustered courage enough to nominate the REV. JOHN STARK

RAVENSCROFT of the Diocese of Virginia. The inquiry soon arose on all sides, "Who is Mr. Ravenscroft?" It was ascertained that not six members of that Convention had ever heard of him; two only had once seen him; and one of those two had heard him preach; and yet, after a few stammering words from the nominator, he received the unanimous vote of the Convention. This detail, however needless it may appear to some, will be regarded by others as one of those unlooked-for orderings of Providence out of which have grown, and are daily growing, some of the richest blessings of the Church.

The scene which occurred at the moment when the election of Mr. Ravenscroft was announced to him has elsewhere been described by the writer, but may well bear to be repeated in this sketch, intended, as it is, to portray some of the more peculiar features of his character.

To the same young Brother who had the honor of nominating him was allowed the gratification of informing him of his election. The account of it may best be given, as at first, in his own words :

"When I rode up to his humble dwelling he met me, as usual, with both hands extended, saying, 'Why, brother G., what has brought you here?' To this I answered, in the same vein, that it was not usual for one gentleman to ask another what had brought him to his house. 'Well, well,' he said, 'come in, come in, my wife has a nice cup of tea for you.' When tea was over, he drew his chair close to mine, and laying his hand on my knee, said, 'But, come, tell me, what brings this God-send of a visit to me?' Without replying, I placed in his hands the certificate of his election, and watched his countenance as he read it with an incredulous and startled look. When at length he fully comprehended its purport, he dropped it in his lap with a deep groan. His wife started at the sound, looking painfully at me to know what was the matter. With a smile and a gentle motion of my hand I quieted her fears, and requested her to say nothing. After a few moments of impressive silence he arose and paced the room several times, groaning at every turn, as if some heavy calamity had befallen him. At length, approaching his wife, he laid the letter in her lap, and retired to the darkness and solitude of his study;—solitude, so far as any human presence was concerned, but in manifest intercourse with Him who alone can direct and rule the heart. After the absence of a half hour he returned with a composed countenance, and standing before me, said: 'Brother G., God's hand is in this thing; I dare not resist it.' The next day I bore his letter of acceptance to a rejoicing Diocese."



How unlike was this to the conduct of some clergymen who ambitiously court the distinction of the Episcopal Office, and of others who as inexcusably shrink from its responsibility, though called to it by the unsought suffrage of their brethren.

In the fall of that year he made his first visitation of the Diocese, attracting many by the affability of his manner, others by his power in the desk and the pulpit, and rejoicing the heart of every Churchman at seeing how graciously God had provided for their spiritual need. Alas, that these visitations should have been so few! Six times did he pass through his Diocese, from mountain to sea-board, in all weathers, and over the roughest roads. When the opening of the seventh spring invited him to a renewal of his labors it found him upon his last bed. For three years his health had been gradually giving way, and on the 5th of March, 1830, he slept in death, in the city of Raleigh, under the roof of a friend \* who had been to him even as a son and a brother.

In person Bishop Ravenscroft was of a commanding figure, so much so as to attract attention wherever he moved. In answer to the question sometimes asked him as to his height, his reply was, "I am just six feet in my stockings." To this noble stature were added limbs finely rounded and well proportioned, with not an ounce of superfluous flesh upon them. From what is told us of Washington they might have been cast in the same mould, both physically and as regards many traits of mind and manner also. His voice was deep and solemn, and when excited, like the roar of a lion. There are some now living who can remember how, in answer to the questions put to him at the time of his consecration in St. Paul's Church, Philadelphia, his deep-toned voice seemed to shake those venerable walls, and to impress the congregation with an almost painful awe. His head was small in proportion to his general size, with a rather narrow forehead, high cheek-bones, and a projecting brow. His eyebrows, which he himself called his "dormer windows," were so large and prominent as completely to shade the eyes, and give them the appearance of being of a dark color, when, in reality, they were a greyish blue, and quite inexpressive, if not dull, when their possessor was silent; but kindling with the lightning's flash when accompanying the roar of his voice.

---

\* Gavin Hogg.



In dress he was simple, plain, and unvarying. Its general style was that of a well-born English gentleman of a century ago. Nothing could have induced him to wear the modern pantaloons. A quaker-like coat, and knee-breeches, with boots and worsted stockings in the winter, and shoes and silk stockings in warm weather constituted his daily and uniform apparel. His gait was firm, measured, and it might almost be said, majestic, and as such truly indicative of his character. On all occasions he seemed to bear himself with such unusual dignity that he could scarcely cross a room without drawing all eyes upon him. The year before his death the writer was with him at the General Convention in Philadelphia, and being desirous of obtaining a good likeness of him, took him to the studios of several of the most approved portrait painters, by way of selecting the most skillful. At each place his striking face and commanding mien so attracted the interest of the several artists and excited such an unusual desire to try their pencils upon him, that one of them approached the writer as he was leaving the room and whispered, "I will take your friend *for nothing*; I am so struck with his appearance." The choice, however, fell upon one (Eichholtz) who was said to be self-taught, but true to nature. The portrait which he painted was indeed a faultless likeness, and now adorns the parlor of the writer, as the remembrance of the original still warms his heart. One of the peculiarities of the Bishop was occasionally to use a coarse word in a kind and playful way. It was whilst sitting for this portrait that he preached that great sermon of his in St. James' Church, from the text "What shall I do to be saved?" On returning from church, he said to the writer: "Did you see that *rascal* in church to-day?" "What rascal, Bishop?" "Why, that fellow Eichholtz. I know that he came there not so much to worship God as to look at me." This was indeed the truth, for the artist confessed afterward that, through the agency of a friend, he had obtained a seat in the centre of the church, with the view of catching the spirit and expression of the Bishop, to give life to his canvas.

Such was the man to whom a gracious Providence had, in an unlooked-for way, directed the infant Church of North Carolina; and such his manner and appearance as he first stood before a people to whom he was so lately a stranger even in name, with

but a short experience of the pastor's life, and himself a comparatively recent convert to the faith that he was about to preach, and to the Church in which he was to be a ruler. And yet, in less than seven years, what a work did he accomplish! It would be difficult for any one who was not a member of the Diocese at that time to conceive the obstacles which then stood in the way of the Church's progress. As a regular organization the Diocese itself was only in its sixth year, with barely enough clergymen to entitle it to a Bishop. The congregations, few in number, were widely scattered, with no medium of inter-communication better than the common wagon road, and what was still harder to be overcome, so connected were they by marriage and other ties with the different denominations around them, as to be under a species of vassalage which repressed, even where it was most fervently entertained, the true spirit of the Church. Although the clergy were sound in their views of the Church as a heaven-ordained agency distinct from the self-appointed authorities of the sects around, there was but one of them \* that fearlessly and habitually set forth her Catholic and Apostolic Character. It was not long, however, before the trumpet voice of their Bishop cheered the faint-hearted, and rallied his people around him firm and united as a Grecian phalanx. A few months after he entered the Diocese a distinguished layman, Speaker of the House of Representatives, said to the writer: "Sir, you have a noble Bishop. He is already making a wide breach in the enemy's walls; you must stand by him."

In dealing with a people but little acquainted with the true character of the Church, his policy was to strike at the more intellectual and influential class of society, and then, with the aid of their example, build up congregations and parishes as opportunity might offer. "*Example descends*," he was frequently heard to say. And such was the effect of his labors in that way that at his death there were very few prominent men in the State that were not either members of our communion, or else its warm friends and advocates. In defence of that policy the writer more than once heard him repeat the story of the Turkish Sultan who, upon being asked by one of his Satraps what he should do in order to

---

\* Rev. Thomas Wright.

put down an insurrection within his Province, as his only reply, took him into the garden, and standing in the midst of a bed of poppies, drew his scymetar and cut off the heads of some of the tallest.

From what has been said it will be seen that Bishop Ravenscroft was indeed a man of marked characteristics. But, though strikingly unlike most men in many particulars, he scorned the affectation of appearing singular. If ever a man was just what he appeared to be, Bishop Ravenscroft was that man. His honesty of character was a positive transparency. He had no concealments, no system of tactics, nothing of what the world calls "policy." Walking with him one day in the streets of Philadelphia, and speaking on this subject, he said to the writer: "There is not a thought in this heart that I would not be willing to publish from Christ's Church steeple." Once at the table of Mr. S——, a distinguished lawyer of that city, where a number of Bishops and clergy were dining, Bishop Ravenscroft made one of his fearless declarations of what he either would do or had done in a case then under discussion. Bishop Hobart, in his usual courtly manner, observed, "But, my dear sir, that would not be good policy." He had scarcely got the words out, when Bishop Ravenscroft, bringing the handles of his knife and fork down with some force upon the table, said, in a tone that made the company start, "Policy! sir, policy! there is no such word between the lids of the Bible." To this the amiable Bishop of New York very quickly responded, "But you know, my good brother, that Saint Paul tells us how he made himself all things to all men." From this slight incident some little insight may be gained into the characteristics of these two great and good men; the one unsparing, fearless, and uncompromising in the cause of truth; the other equally bold in its defence, but more skillful in his warfare, and more desirous to conquer without wounding. It would have been well for Bishop Ravenscroft's comfort, but not for the cause of the Church, if he had known something of the art of those who, on what they call "proper occasions," know how to give truth the "*go by*." He would thereby have avoided that unpleasant controversy into which he was drawn in relation to the Bible Society. Unpleasant to himself, on account of the unfairness of his opponents, but profitable to the Church, because affording him so good

an opportunity of setting forth her true character and defending her claims.

But devoid as Bishop Ravenscroft was of any dishonest concealment of his views, he was equally so of all fearfulness in proclaiming them. Indeed, he seemed truly not to know what fear was. If any one in his presence happened to doubt the *consequences* of any proposed course of action, he would exclaim, in his overpowering way, "Consequences, sir, consequences! what have you or I to do with consequences?" He might well have taken for his motto, "Every plant which my heavenly Father hath not planted shall be rooted up." Several instances of this fearlessness of spirit are treasured up by his friends. The writer of this was told by a brother-in-law of the Bishop that, when at the age of eighteen, he was crossing the ocean to come to this country, the ship in which he was a passenger became so entangled among icebergs that even the Captain himself began to despair of deliverance, when young Ravenscroft, accompanied by another like spirit, with a hatchet in hand, went out on the bowsprit, and by cutting off the end of it enabled the ship to swing off and thus disengage herself from her perilous situation. Another amusing instance of his personal fearlessness may not be without interest to those who may wish to know the man as he was. He was once preaching not very far from his residence, when two young men whom he knew came stamping into the church with their high-heeled boots, rather desirous of attracting attention, than of avoiding the disturbance of the congregation. Taking their seats in one of those old-fashioned square pews, with high backs, they commenced a regular interchange of loud whispers—loud enough to attract the attention of the congregation as well as the preacher. After bearing it for some time Mr. Ravenscroft stopped in his discourse, and mildly said that he would be glad if there would be less talking in the congregation. This checked for a time the conversation between these two young gentlemen; but dropping their heads below the backs of the pews so as to be out of sight, they soon renewed it with increased vigor. When, at length, he could bear it no longer, in one of his thundering tones, and pointing with his finger, he said: "I will thank those two young men in that pew to keep silence, while the Word of God is being preached." Springing from their seats and snatching up their hats they stamped out of

the church with more clatter than when they came in, whilst the preacher proceeded with as much composure as if that little episode had been a part of his sermon. After getting out of the church a council of war was held by them, and it was resolved that nothing short of the cudgelling of the offender could retrieve their lost honor and avenge so gross an insult. Accordingly they adjourned to a neighboring thicket, where each armed himself with a stout club. It was then agreed that one should stand behind the church, while the other should wait for Mr. Ravenscroft at the door. When he came out in his gown the following passed between them:—

"I wish to speak with you, Mr. Ravenscroft."

"Very well, sir; here I am."

"Will you step behind the church with me?"

"Certainly, sir, certainly."

On arriving where the other stood holding his club with a trembling hand there was an awkward pause, broken at length by Mr. Ravenscroft himself asking, "Well, young gentlemen, what do you want with me?" One of them mustered courage enough to answer, "We wish to know what you meant by so insulting us just now." "What insult?" demanded Mr. Ravenscroft, in one of his startling tones. When they stated that it was his speaking to them in the church, and that they demanded an apology from him, the apology came at the top of his voice, in these words, "Boys, I am ashamed of you; and you ought to be ashamed of yourselves. You are shaming your parents, too, for they have taught you better than this. You Jim B——k are the son of a good old Presbyterian Elder, who would be grieved to know how you have behaved to-day. And as for you, Jack B——, you have had Church training, and ought to know better, sir. What would your mother think of you, if she could see you as you are at this moment? Go home boys, go home." The end of the matter was, in his own peculiar manner of relating it, that they "tucked their tails between their legs and went away."

Another instance of a somewhat similar kind occurred on his visit to Tennessee and Kentucky the year previous to his death. One evening the stage-coach, in which he and several others were passengers, took in a man who was considerably intoxicated, and soon began to be very talkative and very profane. After a little

the Bishop, in a kind manner, told him that his language was unpleasant to his fellow-passengers, and requested him to speak without the addition of any oaths. To this, the man replied that his mouth was his own, and that he would do with it as he pleased. The Bishop made no reply; but when his profane language was renewed in a more offensive form he again kindly reminded the man that, when he came into the coach, the passengers were all on good terms with each other, and each in his turn contributing to the pleasure of the others, whilst *he* was making himself disagreeable to all. To this came another and more insulting reply, with a renewal of his outrageous language. The Bishop then, thinking that longer forbearance was ceasing to be a virtue, clapped his hand with some force on the shoulder of the offender, who was sitting next to him, and in his most terrific tone, said, "Utter another oath, sir, if you dare, and I will drop you under the wheels of the coach." A clap of thunder could not more suddenly or more effectually have silenced the wretched man. Not a word was, for some time, spoken by any one in the coach, and the frightened creature never opened his lips during the remainder of the night. As day began to dawn, the poor fellow, to use the very words of the Bishop, "stole several timid side-glances at him, to see whether it was a human being or a grizzly bear that had so growled at him, and laid so huge a paw upon his shoulder." At sunrise next morning he got out at his home, which was not far from the road-side. But before leaving, he turned towards the coach, and said, "Ladies and Gentlemen, I humbly beg your pardon for my conduct last night;" and, addressing himself to the Bishop, said, "Sir, I particularly ask your pardon, and thank you for stopping me, as you did." He then stated that he was not "a drinking man;" but that he had got with some old friends the day before, and had made a fool of himself. The Bishop, a good deal affected by the man's humble apology, said, "My friend, I freely forgive you, but remember that there is One, up 'there,' pointing with his finger, "from whom you must yet receive pardon, and strength also, if you want to be a better man." He then shook his hand, and said, "I hope you may find all well at home."

At another time, on his first visit to Philadelphia, when porters and hack-drivers were allowed to rush into a newly-arrived steam-boat like a set of Algerine pirates boarding a cutter, a stout Irish



porter seized the Bishop's trunk and was in the act of lifting it upon his shoulder, when a stentorian voice made him as quickly return it to its place. On a slight movement being made among some persons standing near, the man again began to lift the trunk, when "PUT IT DOWN," in a voice of thunder, made him once more release his hold. A third attempt was made before the Bishop was ready to move, when, in a lower, but equally terrific tone, he said, "Touch that trunk again sir, before I tell you, and I will drop you into the Delaware." This was enough for Pat, who stood fixed by the side of his anticipated prize, looking with a mixture of fear and wonderment on its owner. After a moment or two more, the Bishop said, "Now, my friend, take the trunk and go ahead of me; but take care to keep within six paces of me." As the writer was then walking at the Bishop's side he was amused to see Pat looking back, every few steps, to be sure that he neither exceeded nor fell short of the prescribed distance. This is a rough story to tell of the good Bishop, and does indeed show him in one of his unflattering points. But let the reader remember that the monarch of the forest is often known to roar in his most pacific moods. The truth is, the Bishop "knew his man," and by that very roughness of manner not only accomplished his present purpose, but very probably gained in that stout Irish heart a friend and admirer for life.

While thinking, one day, of his habitual fearlessness and self-command, the writer was tempted to ask, "Bishop, were you ever '*put out*' in your life?" "Yes, twice," was the immediate answer. "Pray tell me how it was." "Once when my light went out, and again when Brother Hawley's pulpit ran away with me." Upon being asked to explain, he said that, on the first occasion, he was holding an evening service and lecturing at the house of a friend in Richmond; a large number had filled several of the rooms; the prayers were through, and he had, for about five minutes, to use his own words, "got on swimmingly with his subject," when all at once a curtain, as it were, fell before his mind. He could remember neither his text nor a word that he had been saying, and had, after a brief apology, to dismiss the congregation, saying, "My friends, my light has gone out." In the second instance, it will be remembered by many of the older church-goers of the city of Washington that the lofty pulpit of the old St. John's Church,



of which good Dr. Hawley was so long rector, was within the chancel-railing, and placed on wheels, in order that it might be removed to one side on Communion occasions.

"When I was preaching there, one Sunday," said the Bishop in a playful manner, "seeing so many 'big folks' before me, I thought that I would be big too, and accordingly I put a little additional powder into my gun. In the middle of my sermon, when all eyes were directed towards me, I unfortunately lifted my hand somewhat higher than usual, which gave the pulpit a start, and away it went, apparently bent on settling in the midst of the foremost pews crowded with ladies. It was a bare moment, however, before its progress was arrested by the rail of the chancel; but during that moment the church presented a singular scene, the women screaming, and the men springing from their seats with hands uplifted to stop the strange thing."

Another incident may here be noted which may serve to illustrate one of his peculiarities, although some may think that it was carried a little too far. A church had been built in the town of M——n by a general subscription. Although the members of the church were the largest contributors, it not long after fell into the possession of the Presbyterians, but was nevertheless open to the occasional use of others. On one of the Bishop's visits to that place, the writer, as usual when traveling with him, read the prayers, the worthy minister of the church sitting in the pulpit at his back. When the "service" was over, the writer came down and motioned to the Bishop to go up and take his place; but was answered by a shake of the head. Another motion was made, supposing that the first was not understood; but was met by another and more determined shake. A whisper in his ear was equally unavailing to move him. He said that he was not willing to preach with another man in the pulpit behind him. The thing ended rather awkwardly in the worthy man's being requested by a common friend to come down in order to make way for the Bishop. When the writer, as they came from the church, said, "Oh, Bishop, how could you act in that way to-day?" His answer, though amusing, was not equally kind and just. "I have no idea, sir, of a man's sitting behind me and making mouths at me while I am preaching the Word of God." I will add that the worthy minister took it all in a good spirit, until some of his people told him that it was a great insult, when he began to get as angry as they were.

And yet, under all this lion's hide there beat a truly kind and loving heart. Well does the writer remember, as though it were but yesterday, almost the last words uttered by that dear man, a day or two before his death, "Brother G., I have been a rough *creatur*"—as he often purposely pronounced that word—"but," he added with deep feeling, and striking his broad breast, "God knows there was no roughness here." He was very fond of little children, although he often addressed them as little "*trouble-worlds*;" and they became equally fond of him, after they got over the fear of his shaggy eyebrows. A kinder or more thoughtful husband never lived. His devotion to his wife during her last illness was constant and untiring, being scarcely one moment from her bedside, and insisting upon performing for her every office that propriety would admit. And when the writer was committing her body to the ground he asked to be permitted to take the concluding portion of the service at the grave. When he came to "Earth to earth, ashes to ashes, and dust to dust," his voice was so choked and his whole frame shook so violently that it was feared by many that he would fall into the grave. It was, indeed, a strange and moving spectacle to see tears streaming from those eyes that looked in general as though they could not be forced to weep.

The nature of that thing called *tact* was unknown to Bishop Ravenscroft. His straightforwardness could never be induced to give way to mere expediency. His unbending character was not long in being perceived by his people; but they soon learned that, so far from being obstinately wedded to his own views, he was not only open to the reasoning of others, but would often ask the opinions of some of the youngest of his clergy. It was this straightforward, fearless, and uncompromising character that prompted Chief Justice Henderson, when, at a large dinner party, he was called upon for a "toast," to say, "Gentlemen, I give you BISHOP RAVENSCROFT, the St. Paul of the South, in all things," and then pausing for a moment, added, "*except* in making himself all things to all men."

His want of tact in a measure unfitted him for the task of catechising children or conducting a Bible Class. His mind grasped the larger points of a subject so fully as seemingly to leave no room for those lesser details that are easily comprehended by young minds, and serve as convenient stepping-stones to higher

and larger truths. For instance, the writer of this had once prepared a very intelligent class of girls for examination by the Bishop on the New Testament, and was anticipating the result with no little pride, when the very first question "puzzled" both teacher and scholars. "Young ladies, what is the principal petition in the Lord's Prayer?" The only answer was a blush, a frightened expression of the eyes, and a pleading look at their instructor, who had to confess that he had not taught either himself or his class to set any one petition of that prayer before all the others. The Bishop then said that, in his view, its distinguishing feature was that which related to the forgiveness of injuries.

Bishop Ravenscroft was an impressive and deeply interesting reader. That interest was owing more to his evidently understanding and thoroughly feeling his subject than to any skill in the arts of the Rhetorician. His voice, though apparently incapable of much inflection, never palled upon the ear. Not a syllable was lost; for whether he was in the Pulpit or the Desk, a perfect stillness reigned throughout the congregation. The writer was often surprised to see the apparent attention of children who were of too tender an age to understand either the Prayers or the Sermon.

As a Preacher he was justly entitled to be called *evangelical* in the proper and unabused sense of that term; for any one who will look into his sermons cannot fail to see that the Depravity of man, the Atonement of the Cross, and the need of the renewing power of the Holy Ghost were his favorite topics. His sermons were long, seldom less than forty or fifty minutes; but even then, too short to many of his hearers. His only gesture was a slight elevation of the right hand. Although he very seldom preached an unwritten sermon, he had the art of so reading his manuscript that his eye was, for a mere instant, taken from the congregation. He was often asked to hold an Evening Service in the house of a friend; on which occasions he always spoke without either written sermon or notes, and from the first passage that presented itself. And it was frequently remarked by those who heard those lectures that they were even superior to his Pulpit exercises. Though strictly adhering in public, to the prescribed Forms of the Church, he frequently used extempore Prayer in his own family, and amid his friends; and beyond all other men known to the writer, he possessed what may properly be

called the "gift of prayer": Not a mere redundancy of expression, nor expertness in crowding in a multitude of Scripture phrases, but words warm from the heart, and well-befitting the worship of Him to whom they were addressed.

The style of his sermons was plain, as was also their meaning. His straightforwardness was to be seen there as plainly as in his general action. He had no stomach for hair-breadth distinctions; and positively hated what is generally understood as "Metaphysics." His mind was of a character to grasp the strongest points of a subject, leaving all side issues and minor considerations to be dealt with by others. He read but few books, but digested them thoroughly. For the "Fine Arts" he seemed to have but little taste. The Church which he built in Mecklenburg County, on account of its very high pitch and almost square form, was laughingly compared by his friends to a "Tobacco-barn." Both in writing and in conversation he was as fond, as Homer was, of using compound words, such as *Heaven-descended*, *God-ordained*, and *Man-appointed*. There was one word which he frequently used out of its usual meaning,—the word *concerning*, for instance, a "concerning truth," a "concerning thought." And he would even sometimes purposely misspell a word, if it seemed to him to give more force to its meaning:—thus he always wrote "I am *sett* for the defence of the Gospel." Though generally correct in pronouncing his words, he would occasionally take a way of his own; and if reminded as he frequently was, by the writer, that he was going contrary to "Walker's" rules, he would burst out, "Who is Dick Walker? I have as much right to make a Dictionary as he has."

Notice has already been taken of his command over his Congregations. A striking instance of this occurred at a small neighborhood Church in Virginia. He had got, in the Service, as far as the "Creed," and had repeated the first Article, "I believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of Heaven and earth," when he perceived that not one mouth in the Congregation responded to those words. Turning his Prayer-Book over on the Desk, and looking over the congregation with a mixture of trouble and surprise, he said, in a voice that startled every one, "Brethren, am I in the midst of a Heathen or a Christian people? Can it be possible that there is no man or woman present, who believes in 'God

the Father Almighty, Maker of Heaven and earth?" Then, after pausing a moment, as if to let the people recover themselves, he said, "Let us try again." On commencing a second time, his great voice was nearly drowned in the mingled responses of every man, woman, and child in the house. After thus frightening this Congregation, he not long after endeared himself to them by a little piece of thoughtfulness which they hardly expected from him. Soon after the commencement of his sermon a very dark cloud arose, threatening a speedy and heavy fall of rain. Both men and women, who had all come on horse-back, began to feel uneasy about their saddles, and to look wistfully out of the door; but such was their fear of disturbing that big man in the pulpit, that not one of them ventured to leave his seat. Their uneasiness, however, was perceived by Mr. Ravenscroft, who kindly said, "My friends, I will pause five minutes in my discourse, in order that you may take care of your saddles." The house was soon emptied, the saddles thrust under the Church, and, every one reseated before the five minutes were out. From that time forth Mr. Ravenscroft was in high favor with that Congregation.

Although deeply engaged in his work whilst preaching, he seldom failed to notice any marked attention or immediate effect produced on any of the Congregation. When he was preaching that great sermon in St. James' Church, Philadelphia, the Congregation embraced many of the leading men of the Bar and Bench of the City; and the writer, being in the Desk, could plainly see the marked effect of the words of that man of God. The Bishop acting up to his principle of "striking high," had aimed some of his stoutest shafts at a distinguished lawyer, who sat before him. After coming out of the Church, he said, "Did you notice B—y to-day? Why the man was *sitting upon a hackle* through the whole sermon." Those who are at all acquainted with flax-making will be amused with the figure thus used to express the uneasiness of that distinguished man under the smittings of God's Word. But before we left the Church an amusing, or rather characteristic scene took place in the vestry-room, between the Bishop and the Rev. Dr. Montgomery, Rector of the Church, who yielded to none of the Bishop's own Clergy in love and admiration for the man. The Dr. entered the room with an evidently dejected and dissatisfied look, and addressing the Bishop, said, with tears in his

eyes, "Oh, Bishop, that I could preach as *you* do!" "Why *don't* you, sir?" was the blunt reply. "I *can't*, Bishop." "You *can*, sir. Did I preach anything but the simple Gospel to-day?" "No, Bishop, no, but I cannot preach in that way." The Bishop then took his hand and reminded him that it was not by the might or power of man but by the Spirit of God that the Gospel was to accomplish its ends.

Having already introduced the name of a late distinguished Chief Justice of North Carolina, it may not be out of place to record another incident illustrative of the characters of the two men. Near the close of his life the Bishop resided for a year or two in a small village within a mile of the Judge's residence. Having the highest reverence for the Bishop's character, and an equal admiration for the powers of his intellect, the Judge was rejoiced at the prospect of hearing him frequently, and was accordingly early in his pew at the Bishop's first appointment; but strange to say, was never there afterwards. On being asked the reason, he promptly answered with his usual and only oath. "By blood, sir, *I could'n't stand it*. Why, the man poured the whole of his sermon right down into my pew; and didn't seem to have a word for any body else." What stronger proof could be given on the one hand, of the convincing power of God's word; and on the other of the force and faithfulness with which that noble Bishop dispensed it.

Bishop Ravenscroft was what the world is pleased to call a "High-Churchman," but was, in no sense, a Partyman. In a letter to the writer, he said:

"Everything serves to convince me more and more of the injurious tendency of all half-way measures. I will therefore, have nothing to do with them. Every circumstance also confirms the propriety of being open and candid in declaring our principles. I see that success follows them; and that loss and dilapidation are the result of a different system. No other course can effectually expose and defeat the sectarian arts of our adversaries. So long as they can have it to say, from the conduct of our people, that the differences are, as they endeavor to represent, unimportant, so long will our exertions be neutralized by our own unjustifiable indifference to their vital consequences."

But whilst thus uncompromising in his views of the nature of the Church, and of the Divine authority of a threefold ministry, he knew how to make allowance for those Brethren who, out of a



mistaken kindness to others, lower the claims of the Church to a level with those of the multitudinous Denominations that surround her. When a late Professor of the Theological Seminary of Alexandria was once the subject of conversation, he broke in, "What R—l K—h! If there is a man in the world that lives close to his God, it is R—l K—h; but, sir, he knows no more of the Church than my horse." The wretched system of Calvin, which finally disordered the intellect of that worthy Professor, was held by Bishop Ravenscroft in perfect abomination. He could scarcely speak of it with patience. And, he had just as little sympathy with those itinerant Revivalists who were going about, as he used to say, in his rough way "dispensing the Holy Ghost from their breeches' pockets." "You can't," he was more than once, heard to say,—*"You can't weld a Christian out, at one heat."*

Although he lived when the Church in America was comparatively in its infancy, he was as hopeful and as confident of its future growth as if it were then before his eyes; and was as fearless in setting forth its Apostolic and authoritative character as if the whole world stood at his back. Hence it comes that "North Carolina Churchmanship" has almost grown into a proverb; and that his successor in the Episcopate, when leaving her pure communion for the corruption of Rome, could carry with him only one weak woman who subsequently returned, not to the bosom of the Church she had deserted, but united herself with one of the least enlightened sects of the land.

Never was there a man who entertained juster ideas of what a Bishop of the Church ought to be, or who more fully acted up to that character. To his Clergy he was a loving father, as well as a wise ruler, and took a lively interest in all that concerned them. That he was even proud of them he evidently showed when one day, standing in front of Trinity Church, New York, conversing with one of the D. Ds., of that City, he placed one hand on the shoulder of the writer, and addressing the Rev. Gentleman, said, with a snap of the fingers, "I wouldn't give my fourteen Boys, sir, for your whole Diocese." And this reminds the writer of another evidence to show how justly he appreciated the character of his holy Office. It was once hinted to him that he was likely to be invited to a much larger Diocese. He immediately, and in his strong manner, said, "No, sir; I would loose this right arm sooner

than set the first example of 'Translation' in the American Episcopate." To each of his Clergy he bequeathed some little legacy to assure them that they were remembered by him to the last. And it is not doubted that he continued to pray for them after he felt in his last hour, that prayer was no longer needed by himself. No Bishop was ever more prompt at the call of duty, or spared himself less in its performance. Punctual to a moment, he kept no man, and especially, no Congregation waiting for him. If an appointment was to be met he took no thought of the weather, and to use his own words he would "be on hand" at the appointed hour; and if he found "no congregation there, would ride around the Church, and leave his horse's tracks in the snow, as a testimony against them." There was no duty which he more frequently impressed upon his Clergy than that of faithfully preparing their Candidates for Confirmation. One of his letters now lies before the writer, in which he says, "If Judge R . . . n thinks of Confirmation he will, when I come, have an opportunity which may not soon recur. Examine faithfully, by giving him the true grounds on which the worth of the Ordinance rests,—heartily repentance, and true faith."

From all that has been stated it may be easily seen that the manner of Bishop Ravenscroft was rather of the commanding than winning order. By a casual observer it might have been pronounced harsh and dictatorial. He was himself aware of his want of the *suaviter in modo*. For he once playfully said to the writer, "Brother G. *you* have too much milk-and-water in your composition, and *I* have too much vinegar. Now, if we could be kneaded together, and rolled out, and divided, what two capital fellows we would make." Though full of such little pleasantry, he never let himself down for a moment from his habitual dignity of deportment; and through a seven years' intimacy the writer never knew him to laugh aloud. He was no great talker in mixed companies, because he had no taste for those inferior subjects which make up the staple of general conversation. He often produced a smile by his strong and homely comparisons, some of which have already been noted. To a lady who was thinking of removing from his Parish, in Virginia, to a place where there were no Church privileges, and no Christian communion, he said, "Sister G—e, I tell you, what, *A chunk, by itself, will go out.*" To a

brother Clergyman of Virginia, who told him that his Vestry would not let him use a Surplice, he said "If they were my Vestry, sir, they should either *pull or balk.*" To a friend who was borrowing from him a horse that trotted very hard, he said, "You are welcome to him, sir, but there will be plenty of day-light between you and the saddle."

While penning these lines, the following incident was related to the writer as a true story; and it certainly fits in with what has been shown of the Bishop's unceremonious and summary way of treating a subject.

On one of his journeyings he encountered a worthy old Baptist Preacher who had long desired to see him and to break a lance with him on his favorite subject of *immersion*. As soon as they were introduced to each other the old gentleman challenged the Bishop to a regular discussion as to the proper *mode* and proper *subjects* for Christian Baptism. He readily consented, but said, "There is one preliminary question which I would like to have settled before we begin;—that is, '*Where, sir, do you get your authority to baptize any body, or in any way?*'" This was an unexpected thrust for which the good man was entirely unprepared, and put an end at once to the hope which he had so confidently entertained of an easy victory.

In his religious character Bishop Ravenscroft was an example to all who knew him. He was emphatically a "man of prayer." It was the good fortune of the writer to accompany him in many of his visitations, and oftentimes to occupy the same room with him. He had thus an opportunity of witnessing his morning and evening devotions, at his bedside, when a more retired place could not be obtained for the purpose. On one occasion finding a small adjoining room unoccupied he shut himself in, with the hope of being out of the hearing as well as of the sight of every one. The writer happening to go into the room which he had just left, was startled and alarmed at hearing deep and repeated groanings proceeding from that little chamber. Recognizing the well-known voice of his beloved Bishop, and supposing him to be taken with a sudden and painful illness, he was about flying to his relief, when he was arrested by distinguishing words of earnest prayer. It was that man of God, not in bodily suffering, but mourning for the thousandth time over his past offences, and wrestling, in all the fervency of his

strong nature, to obtain renewed pardon, and more and more grace and strength to meet the demands of his high and holy calling. He was a constant reader of the Bible, and that without note or comment. Indeed he seemed to set but little value on any Commentator; for, to use his own expression, "Whenever he consulted them in any difficulty, he found that they were just as deep in the mud, as he was in the mire."

To the poor he was a liberal giver; and so little did he care to accumulate or even to save, that after commencing life with a large fortune he may be said to have died insolvent, inasmuch as the little that was left was scarcely enough to cover a security debt thrown upon him by an undeserving friend. His style of living was plain and simple, and his house the abode of hospitality, and a second home to his Clergy. But whoever sat at his table of a Sunday had to be content with a cold meal, for he allowed no cooking in his house on that day; not only from obedience to the commandment, but as he said, to allow his servants equal spiritual privilege with himself. His dislike to all unnecessary expense and display was strikingly shown in his directions about his funeral. Some time before his death he inquired of a carpenter what would be his price for a plain pine coffin, stained black? Upon being answered "Three dollars," he then ordered that just such a coffin, and none other should be prepared for him. He would not even sanction the show and expense of a hearse. In his will he wrote: "Let the body of my sulky be taken off, and my coffin placed upon the shafts. Let my little horse 'Pleasant' carry me to the grave, led by my faithful servant 'Johnson.' Let four verses of the 16th Psalm of David be sung at my burial; but not a word be added to the Service which the Church has appointed for such occasions; for that is too good for me."

His last sermon was preached while sitting in the Chancel of Christ's Church, Raleigh, from these words, "Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the work of Thy hands. They shall perish, but Thou shalt endure; they all shall wax old as doth a garment; and as a vesture Thou shalt change them, and they shall be changed; but Thou art the same, and Thy years shall not fail." *Ps. cii.* 25, 26, 27 verses.

From this time he declined rapidly. The writer, though living

fifty miles distant, was frequently at his bedside; and though grieved at the thought of soon losing so loving a friend and father, was comforted at seeing that Death had for him no terror, and the grave was looked to only as a resting place. When the writer was about to leave him, two days before his death, he took his hand and said, "My dear father, you have served God faithfully, and I feel sure therefore, that nothing is allowed to obscure your view of the inheritance provided for you." His answer was, "Not a cloud, sir, not a cloud."

The writer will here, in conclusion, introduce one more incident in connection with the Bishop's last illness. His disease was of a nature to unstring his whole nervous system, and produce an impatience and irritability utterly unknown to him when in health. He would become strangely excited from the slightest cause; but the feeling would pass away as quickly as it came, followed by an acknowledgment of his weakness and an humble request to be forgiven. It should here be mentioned that previous to his last sickness, he had promised to leave a portion of his sermons to be published for the benefit of the Diocesan Missionary Society. He had also in his will directed his Executor to burn every manuscript of whatsoever kind that was not marked for publication. Whilst in this unnerved state, and fast approaching his end it was greatly feared that he had forgotten to mark those sermons, or else that he had not sufficient strength to do it. Here was indeed a painful quandary; for unless this was done, his Executor, then present, declared that he would literally comply with the Bishop's will by destroying, the day after his death, every scrip of his pen, including of course, all his sermons.

In order to save this treasure to the Diocese and to the Church at large, the writer was requested to approach the dying Bishop on that subject. It was a truly painful undertaking to him, knowing as he did his extreme irritability as well as great bodily weakness; but the occasion demanded it.

Though the greatest caution was used in broaching the subject, the effect upon the poor Bishop was truly distressing. For a few moments his nervous excitement seemed as if it would extinguish the last lingering spark of life. The scene was as painful then, as it is indescribable now; for the writer really feared that he had given the death-blow to his beloved friend and father in

God. It was not long however, before this strange paroxysm began to subside. Then followed a scene of a different character. When the heaving of his breast was settling down, like the swell of the ocean after a storm, in a voice scarcely audible he said, to the writer who stood weeping at some distance from the bed. "My son, come here, come here; come closer; Oh forgive your old father; forgive him; he is not himself; he is nothing but a child; you know that he loves you, and would not willfully give you the slightest pain." He then said, "Kneel down; put your head lower; lower still." When it at last rested on the bedside his uplifted hands fell upon it, and pressing with all his little remaining strength, he poured forth, upon that head a stream of blessing, far exceeding that which good old Jacob showered upon all his sons. At this moment those hands still seem to press the writer's head; and whatever favor, either from God or man may since have come upon him he willingly ascribes in good part, to the benedictions of that dying hour.

He was subsequently informed that in a short time after he had left the room the Bishop said to his servant, "Johnson, Prop me up in my bed; give me my pencil; bring me that box; knock off the lid, and hand me my sermons one by one." He then, in that weak and almost unconscious state, glanced merely at the subject or text of each, and put a cross mark on such as he was willing to leave behind him.

This rather tedious narration may appear needless to many, but it is not without its bearing on the reputation of Bishop Ravenscroft. For among the sermons thus marked by his dying hand, and contained in the first edition of his works were discovered by the Publisher two discourses, with some slight alterations, by a distinguished Divine of England. How they came to be thus found among the Bishop's own sermons may be accounted for in the following manner.

While a Candidate for Orders he acted as Lay-Reader for the benefit of his neighbors. Finding that they were strongly prejudiced against sermons read out of a printed volume, but were willing to tolerate them in the manuscript form, with the view of removing that objection, he copied, with his own hand, a few of the same sermons, making such alterations and omissions as would better adapt them to the capacity and circumstances of the con-



gregation. These sermons, being in the same hand-writing with the others, labeled in like manner, and unintentionally thrown into the same box might, very naturally and excusably, be mistaken for his own, when, as we have just seen, under extreme prostration both of mind and body, he undertook, by a mere glance at their texts or titles, to make the intended selection.

With this statement, unnecessary as it may appear to those who knew him, the writer closes this tribute of affection, written less with ink than out of the wellings of a fond heart, and extended far beyond what was first designed. The interest of his subject has led him on insensibly from one pleasant reminiscence to another. His once idolized Diocesan has seemingly stood before him in that mingling of grandeur and loveliness which were ever contending for mastery in his true character. May he, from the Paradise of the blessed, forgive his son, if he has said anything of him but the truth. While making this feeble offering to his memory the writer can truly say, after the manner of Bishop Horne, that the hours flew swiftly by; he was loth to obey the calls to both rest and food; his subject grew upon him with an absorbing and almost painful interest to the very last; and he only sorrowed, when he found that his work was done.

---

#### ART. V.—THE PASTORAL EPISTLES.

In our former articles \* we endeavored to show that the conclusions best warranted by facts and reasoning, were these—

That the visit to Crete and Epistle to Titus are to be placed within the three years' residence of St. Paul at Ephesus. That the First Epistle to Timothy was written from Cæsarea during the imprisonment there of two years. That there is no historical incompatibility in any passage of Scripture with these views, nor improbability from any development of Church polity or institutions, and that the other objections possess little weight.

We have before adverted to the theory of two imprisonments with an interval between them of four or five years, devoted to apostolic visitations and labors. It is this theory we proceed to

---

\* July and October.

discuss. The position which the Second Epistle to Timothy occupies, can be best settled after such examination.

It is in the first place material to trace the progress of St. Paul from Cæsarea to Rome, where, all agree, an imprisonment took place.

After the appeal some time elapsed before the voyage to Italy began. The day after sailing they touched at Sidon. Passing under Cyprus \* they came to Myra, a city of Lycia. The centurion found there a ship of Alexandria bound to Italy. They then sailed under Crete to Fair Havens on the southern side of Crete. At last they reached Melita (Malta) where they spent three months. Landing at Puteoli, they journeyed to Rome, when the centurion delivered the prisoners to the captain of the guard, where Paul was suffered for some time to dwell by himself, with a soldier to guard him.

Then follows, "and Paul dwelt two whole years in his own hired house, and received all that came in unto him, preaching the kingdom of God with all confidence, no man forbidding him."

Thus the narrative in the Acts terminates. Other passages of Scripture connected with the subject are noticed in the ensuing discussion.

We submit the following propositions:

1. When St. Luke wrote the last passage in Acts, the imprisonment, which had then lasted two years still continued, and was of the same light character.

It appears to be satisfactorily made out that St. Luke wrote the Acts, and sent it to Theophilus from Rome, at the close of the two years mentioned. It is urged by some critics that the first and natural construction is, that the past fact of residence was followed by something else, "and then" for example, being premised; yet it is scarcely credible that if such residence had been closed, either by death, natural or violent, or by a release, it would not have been mentioned. The idea of Shrader that St. Luke was deterred from mentioning the death by fear of Nero is visionary. It could at least have been stated that he had died. (See Olshausen apud Clark's Foreign Theology Library, Vol. 13, p. 221, and Davidson's Intro. Vol. 2, p. 528). Dr. Davidson states and answers the

---

\* Along the Northern shore.

arguments of writers who affirm that the passage was written after the two years of captivity. He concludes that it was written during such captivity.

St. Luke was with the Apostle when the Epistle to Philemon (v. 24) that to the Colossians, (10, 14) and when Second Timothy were written (10 v. 11). St. Paul was then in bonds.

2. St. Paul had not been arraigned during those two years at Rome before any tribunal or judge. No answer or defence had of course been made. St. Luke's omission of such a fact is a very strong proof that nothing of the kind had taken place. He was suffered to dwell by himself, with a soldier at first; then he was in his own hired house, teaching and exhorting, no one forbidding him.

Mr. Burton \* is the only writer, that I am aware of, who supports the theory of such an arraignment and defence. He refers to the seventh verse of the first chapter of Philippians. "Inasmuch as both in bonds, and in the defence and confirmation of the Gospel, ye are all partakers of my grace."

The word apology (defence) used in this passage is the word used in Second Timothy iv. 16, "in my first defence," but Dr. Ellicott says it must be connected with the word translated *confirmation*.

*Olshausen* supposes that it refers to the judicial process which led to the imprisonment, that, as I understand him, at Jerusalem.

But what is the meaning the words best bear? The grace St. Paul speaks of was the grace of suffering in support of the Gospel, and of this grace, or of any grace, possessed by himself, they, the Philippians were partakers. Ye share with me the grace which I have had in my bonds, and in any vindication and confirmation of the Gospel. The other version, "partakers with me of grace" will not vary this result. The supposition of Dr. Burton has a very slight foundation.

3. During the two years at Rome, the Epistles to the Ephesians, to the Philippians, the Colossians, and that to Philemon were written. Timothy came to Rome during this period, uniting in three of such Epistles. St. Luke was also there, when three of such epistles

---

\* First three centuries, Vol. 1, p. 264

were written. The Second Epistle to Timothy stating "that no one stood by me, but all forsook me" does not imply a departure from Rome, but only the absence and want of the countenance of friends at the trial. It does not disprove the fact of St. Luke being at Rome during the trial. Dr. Ellicott renders it "stood forward with me" referring to the advocate supporting the accused, and to the practice of Christians encouraging their brethren in prison. The phrase "deserted or forsook me" implies no more than such neglect "to support him," (*Pastoral Epistles* 178.

4. The Epistle to the Hebrews, if rightly attributed to St. Paul, was written when Timothy was absent, whether imprisoned or not. Even if he rejoined the Apostle, they were soon separated, and this separation continued when Second Timothy was written. The better opinion is, that Hebrews was written from Rome during the two years confinement.

The views of the most learned and able of the late writers as to this Epistle, appear to leave the authorship between St. Paul and Apollos. Dr. Davidson has a very able argument for its authenticity as a genuine Pauline Epistle, written from Rome. The testimony of the Alexandrian Church is very marked. Clement about the year 200, Dyonysius, Theognostus, Alexander and Athanasius 320, and Euthatius 460, concur in the same view. (Westcott Canon New Testament 396-414). The tardy acceptance of it into the canon of the Latin Church cannot, as a question of evidence, be placed upon an equal footing with its acceptance in the Eastern.

Dr. Davidson has a difficulty arising out of the text—"they which are of Italy salute you," in reconciling it with the idea of the Epistle being written at Rome. He notices that several manuscripts have the subscription "from Rome," instead of "from Italy." These subscriptions, it is admitted, are unreliable. But the passage is in the text (v. 24). Allow it full force, yet we suggest that converts from other parts of Italy would gather at Rome to hear the Apostle. There would be Romans among them, although not all Romans. So the meaning may be. The Christians of Italy now with me at Rome, salute you.

But from Lange's Commentary (on Hebrews, p. 13 and p. 214) we find that several learned critics consider the phrase to indicate, that the Epistle was written outside of Italy to Jewish Christians

at Rome. He himself leaves the point undecided. The opinion of the ancients is allowed to have been in favor of its composition at Rome.

5. Timothy, as before stated, joined the Apostle at Rome at some time during the two year's imprisonment. He was absent, perhaps had been imprisoned, when Hebrews was written. \* He was absent, and generally supposed to have been at Ephesus, when Second Timothy was written.

6. St. Paul had reasonable grounds during these two years for supposing that he would be liberated. Hence he expresses the hope and even strong expectation of re-visiting the scenes of his former ministrations, but all this hope and confidence is mingled with doubt or despondency.

The success of the Apostle before Agrippa, the lightness of his confinement at Rome, the character of the accusations involving only questions of worship to which the Emperor was then indifferent, justified the expectation of a deliverance. Yet uncertainty and forboding were blended with the hope. We cannot say whether the shadow or the light most prevailed.

The following passages sustain these views. "I, Paul, the prisoner of Jesus Christ for you Gentiles. . . . I, therefore, the prisoner of the Lord, beseech you. . . . But that ye may know my affairs, and how I do, Tychicus, a beloved brother and faithful minister shall make known to you all things." (Ephesians *passim*.)

"To abide in the flesh is more needful for you, and having this confidence, I know that I shall abide, and continue with you all, for your furtherance and joy in the faith. . . . Yet if I be offered upon the sacrifice and service of your faith, I joy and rejoice with you all. All the saints salute you, chiefly they that are of Cæsar's household. I trust in the Lord to send Timotheus unto you shortly. Him I hope to send presently, so soon as I shall see how it will go with me. But I trust in the Lord that I also myself shall come shortly." (Philippians *passim*.) "Know ye that our brother Timothy is set at liberty (*hath been sent abroad*) with whom, if he come shortly, I will see you." (Hebrews xiii.

---

\* Know ye that our brother Timothy is set as liberty, with whom, if he come shortly, I will (shall) see you. (Lange's Hebrews, p 218.)

23). Pray for us, I beseech you, the rather to do this, that I may be restored to you the sooner. (*Ibid.* xviii. 19.)

"But withal prepare me also a lodging, for I trust that through your prayers, I shall be given unto you. (*Philemon* v. 22).

When these passages are brought together they seem to indicate, sometimes the utmost confidence of obtaining freedom, and sometimes the deep presentiment of a certain death. He directs the preparation of a lodging at Colosse, yet if he became a sacrifice for the furtherance of the Philippians in faith, it will be with joy. And the temperament of St. Paul—the union of sanguine hope and deep despondency, gives intensity to his language.

We are warranted in saying that these passages are consistent with the fact of one imprisonment lasting until his execution.

7. After the close of the two years there was an arraignment. It was met by a successful answer and defence. This was through the strength given by the Lord, when the danger was so great that all deserted him. This direct communication of support from heaven was for some important object in the advancing the cause of the gospel.

But it is almost a certainty that there was no liberation in any sense, either a respite or absolute freedom, until such arraignment and successful defence. If by being "delivered out of the mouth of the lion," \* is meant an absolute freedom, it was the consequence of this defence.

No substantial reason can be given why St. Paul should have been brought to trial, and at such imminent peril of life, between the autumn of 63 the close of the two years, and July 64. † But if, when the persecution began, he was in his modified confinement, then would concur, the hatred of the Jews, the pretence that Christians were state enemies declaring that there was another King, and the fury of the populace, to lead to his immediate slaughter, or closer custody. That he was somewhat a prisoner and guarded, would save him from assassination; and influences in Cæsar's household may have obtained for him a trial.

Assuming (as we think is reasonably proven,) that there was no trial until after the expiration of the two years and more, we have

---

\* 2 Timothy iv. 17.

† Dr. Davidson's View. The fire at Rome was of this date.



next the fact of a trial and successful defence. The passages in Second Timothy are almost our only Scriptural guide, as the far better conclusion is, that the other Epistles from Rome were written during the two years.

"At my first answer no man stood with me, but all forsook me. Notwithstanding, the Lord stood with me, and strengthened me, that by me the preaching might be fully known, and that the Gentiles might hear; and I was delivered out of the mouth of the lion."

"And the Lord shall deliver me from every evil work, and will preserve me unto his heavenly kingdom."

"I am now ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is near. I have fought a good fight. I have finished my course. Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness."

"Do thy diligence to come shortly unto me. Do thy diligence to come before winter."

"The cloak that I left at Troas with Carpus, when thou comest, bring with thee, and the books, but especially the parchments."

"Demas has forsaken me, and departed unto Thessalonica; Crescens unto Galatia; and Titus unto Dalmatia; only Luke is with me."

We have in the first place proof of a trial, involving imminent peril; and a defence successful in averting that peril. It was deliverance from the lion's mouth, and we cannot but consider that this means deliverance from being cast to wild beasts. This is the theory of Benson, Michaelis, and Dr. Hales, though strongly opposed by Ellicott. \*

In the next place, the Apostle considers his fate as inevitable; his course as finished. Yet he did not think his death would be immediate. He requests Timothy to come to him, and before the winter, and bring the cloak and parchments with him.

Two points are made prominent; a deliverance from instant peril, and an assurance that his labors were soon to terminate with his life. There are no details of any intervening labors, journeys, or events. There are no hopes uttered of freedom to depart. What he does say is consistent with a slight relaxation of his captivity, and a very limited exercise of his ministry. Indeed, the advocates of the Interval period are decided upon the point that

---

\* *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 179 u.

there was no absolute liberation between the defence stated in Second Timothy and the Martyrdom.

The deliverance, then, produced by the heaven-derived strength of his defence, was only a respite and escape from immediate condemnation. He was made so far free as to be able to declare and preach the Gospel; entirely to fulfil his ministry to the Gentiles, in some respect unperformed. During this respite the Second Epistle to Timothy was written, perhaps as part of that unaccomplished task. Then at some subsequent time the Martyrdom occurred, and they who fix its date as late in the year 64 or in 65, appear to have the great weight of evidence in their favor. The text does not exact more than a limited preaching, if any, as to places or periods. The phrase, "that all the Gentiles might hear" is plainly figurative. I believe all commentators concur in this. This phrase and the one that "by me the preaching might be fully known" are treated as the public avowal and defence of the Gospel in the Roman Capital, at the highest earthly tribunal; perhaps in the forum." \*

Mr. Burton, who advocates a full release, and a return to Rome about the year 67, speaks of the Apostle being called upon to make a public defence, and for that time he was spared; but he was only reserved for a protracted imprisonment, and his doom was probably determined some short time after he wrote to Timothy. †

Dr. Davidson, the supporter of the theory of one imprisonment only, admits that there was such a relaxation of severity after the defence, as to allow of a preaching at Rome. He was reserved to make known the truth further at Rome, the center and metropolis of heathenism.

Thus, adhering rigidly to Scripture, supplying the date of the fire at Rome, we submit that a consistent and rational statement is substantially this: The confinement of St. Paul at Rome as a prisoner remained in its laxity after the closing passage of the Acts was written; after the two whole years had expired; after the summer of A. D. 63.

It is the most reasonable supposition that, after the fire of July,

---

\* Barnes' Int. to the 2 Epistles § 1, Pastoral Letters, p. 178, citing Weiser. Conybeare, and Howson support the same view.

† Burton's Three Centuries, Vol. 1, p. 313-314.

64, the trial took place, and by the interposition of heaven, his life was spared.

That a period of respite was allowed, during which he wrote the Second Epistle to Timothy; and as he begs him to come before the winter it was probably written in the autumn of 64; and the trial and temporary deliverance took place, of course, before this was written, and after July, 64.

And that, as no text or word of Scripture narrates an act or word of the Apostle afterwards, and this Epistle is filled with the consciousness of his approaching doom, we must conclude that all his labors were then ended, and death gave him the crown laid up for him. The year 65, at the latest, closed his course, and gave to Christ the persecutor he had changed to an Apostlé, on the road to Damascus.

But this investigation would be incomplete and unsatisfactory if the arguments of the advocates of the Interval theory were not examined.

I have before stated in the language of Dr. Paley and of Conybeare and Howson, what this theory is. It assumes a full liberation in 63, a return to Rome in 67 or 68, and an execution then; and the interval is filled with apostolic labors. A visit to most of the scenes of his former ministrations is supposed, a long sojourn in Spain, and by some, the planting of the Gospel in Britain and Gaul.

All this large hypothesis has not one word of explicit statement in Scripture to support it; has the better argument that there never was any absolute liberation, to repel it; and is placed upon inferences very insufficient to sustain it.

The following passages are cited:

That to the Philippians: "I trust in the Lord that I also myself shall come shortly" (ii. v. 24). "I know that I shall abide and continue with you all, for your furtherance and joy of faith." (*Ibid.* i. 25, 26.) "But withal, prepare me a lodging, for I trust that through your prayers I shall also be given unto you" (Philemon). This was written to Philemon at Colosse, in Phrygia, Asia Minor.

He expresses to the Hebrews the desire that they would pray for him, that he might be restored to them the sooner; that

Timothy was set at liberty (sent abroad), with whom, if he come shortly, I will see you" (xiii. 19-23).

I have before noticed these passages. They indicate a strong assurance of his being freed, an assurance justified by the favorable treatment then received. They prove his intention to visit the places named upon such release. They prove no more. Some weight is justly attributed to them, but they are plainly insufficient of themselves to support the theory. The passage from Philippians is referred to as spoken prophetically, and indicating the certainty of the event. But if this is so, the same force should be given to the passage in Acts (xx. v. 25), "I know that ye shall see my face no more." Yet Dr. McKnight and others contend that this was only the strong expression of a desponding mood. He did see the Ephesians again, as they assert. But why should not the language in Philippians be equally the strong expression of a hopeful mood, as that in Acts, of a desponding one?

The passages chiefly relied upon are found in the Second Epistle to Timothy, written, as these advocates consider, about 66 or 68. The Apostle requests Timothy to come to him before winter, and to bring with him his cloak, books and especially the parchments left at Troas with Carpus.

Now St. Paul was at Troas on his return to Asia Minor, before the meeting at Miletus. We may well suppose that the articles were left at Troas on this occasion. It is to be remembered that he went by land, on foot, from Troas to Assos, where they took him in.

The argument used is this: It is incredible, assuming that the things were then left, that St. Paul should not have sent for them before. He allowed them to remain for a period which these writers compute at over six years. Hence, there must have been a visit to Troas much later.

It may be answered,—When they were left at Troas, St. Paul was on his rapid journey to Jerusalem. There was no delay, except of seven days at Tyre, caused by the unloading of the ship. Then followed the uprising of the people on account of his bringing Greeks into the Temple, with Trophimus the Ephesian. Then ensued his long imprisonment at Cæsarea. During that time, however, he had a well-founded expectation of a speedy release. This is clear from the close of the 24th chapter of Acts. He

had made a deep impression upon Felix, who had sent for him often. Money would have procured a liberation. Had he not appealed unto Cæsar before Festus, he would have been discharged by Agrippa. We may conclude that he would have gone to Ephesus upon his release, and perhaps to Troas.

Again, it seems certain that the first intention of those who carried St. Paul from Cæsarea to Rome was to sail into the *Ægean* Sea, across it to Greece, and so to Italy. The ship they first embarked in was of Adramyttium, a city only a short distance from Troas. Assos was on the gulf of Adramyttium. They did sail in that vessel to Myra, in Lycia, going under Cyprus (east of the island) on account of the winds. Myra was in their course for the *Ægean*, and is but a short distance from the opening of that sea. Here the Centurion found a vessel sailing for Italy, and embarked in it. Then began the disastrous voyage through the Mediterranean.

There is nothing to warrant the conclusion of some writers, that it was the original plan to find a ship to cross the Mediterranean. On the contrary, it seems the Centurion availed himself of finding a vessel so bound, to save himself much trouble in a journey chiefly by land.

Thus, St. Paul may have expected to obtain the articles during this voyage, and was disappointed by the change of plan.

As to the omission to send for them during the residence at Rome, the reasoning of the advocates of the Interval period may be adopted. St. Paul had a strong conviction of being released, and revisiting some at least of the scenes of his former ministries. Macedonia would be among them; and to go to Philippi he would visit Troas. If this explains his omission to send for them during the two years at Rome, it is amply sufficient to account for the omission during the residence at Cæsarea.

It appears that the articles were of little importance to him, except the parchments. The value of the latter would have made him unwilling to trust any common messenger with them. When all hope of personally reclaiming them was over, and he looked for Timothy to come to him, he would naturally desire that the latter should bring them. Timothy would as probably go by the way of Troas to Rome as by any other route.

One interpretation is that the word rendered "cloak" \* is more accurately translated "portmanteau." † If so, it would contain probably the books and parchments. It would be landed, as St. Paul remained seven days in Troas. It was not put on board when the ship sailed for Assos. As St. Paul went on foot from Troas to the latter place, it was not convenient to carry it with him. This view is almost as applicable to the thick riding cloak. He left Greece in the spring.

But the question is not can we give an absolutely sufficient explanation of the delay in getting the things left at Troas? The question is, must we necessarily deduce an unnoticed visit to the last place after the sojourn at Rome, from such delay? Is there no other explanation of it possessing reasonable plausibility? Surely there is.

The statement "Erastus abode at Corinth" is next relied upon.

An Erastus was Chamberlain at Corinth when the Epistle to the Romans was written. He joins in the salutation. An Erastus is also mentioned as having been sent from Ephesus to Macedonia with Timothy (Acts xix. 21). Whether the Chamberlain was the same person as the missionary is disputed. ‡

It is urged that St. Paul could not have meant that Erastus remained there during the whole period of over six years. Timothy well knew of his first residence there. The apostle must be speaking of a later period, when he had revisited the East, and returned to Rome.

But if Erastus the Chamberlain was the missionary, there is no reason for supposing that he abode without intermission at Corinth. We see many of the ministers under St. Paul sent to different places at various times. All that is said is, that at the time of writing, or rather at the time of his latest information, Erastus resided at Corinth. Between the time we first find him there and this period, there may have been numerous changes.

But as the Epistle to the Romans was written after Erastus went with Timothy into Macedonia, and he was no doubt ordained, I think it very improbable that he could have been the Chamberlain of Corinth. If there was another, the one sent to Macedonia, and

\* *Pemulam*, a thick riding coat. *Forcellini Diet.*

† *Lango's Second Timothy*, 116 u.

‡ *Ellicott Pastoral Ep.*, p. 181.



the same referred to in Second Timothy, his intermediate abode or scene of labor is untraced, and the statement gives not the slightest support to the great hypothesis it is called to aid.

The only real difficulty rests in the passage, "But Trophimus have I left at Miletus sick."

It is urged that Timothy was with the Apostle at Rome long enough to unite in several Epistles. If there were two imprisonments, this union must have been during the first. If St. Paul refers to his having left Trophimus at Miletus, when he met the elders, Timothy must have known it at the very time. If it was when he went from Cæsarea to Rome, (and it is to be noticed that he was as near Miletus as the Island of Cnidus), it is incredible that Timothy, (assumed to have been at Ephesus), should not have known it. It is further incredible that during the residence at Rome, he should not have been apprised of the fact. And if it had occurred at Miletus in Crete, the last difficulty is equally great.

Dr. Ellicott adverts to an interpretation by Winer, that the phrase is "they left," meaning "his comrades," and treats it as groundless.

He observes also, that the Miletus, in Crete, is on the north coast, and St. Paul never went near this. He says, "Still more hopeless is the attempt to change the reading with the Arab version, to *Melita* off the Island of Sicily," (Malta).

We find, then, that there is a version, fixing that island as the place where Trophimus was left.

It has also been contended by Bryant and others, that the shipwreck took place at Milete in the Adriatic. Trophimus may have been left there.

The improbability of Timothy's not knowing of this sickness, if Miletus near Ephesus was meant—the almost certainty of his knowing it—and the improbability of the Apostle's not telling him of it at Rome, are circumstances of very great weight. These improbabilities are diminished upon the supposition, either that *Melita* (Malta) or Milete in the Adriatic was the place.

Baronius, Beza, Grotius and others consider that *Melita* (Malta) is referred to; a mistake occurring in the Manuscripts. Dr. Davidson rejects this idea, merely on the ground that conjectural emendations should not be allowed.

It is clear that Trophimus was not left sick at Miletus, when the elders were summoned there by St. Paul. He was with him at Jerusalem on the eve of the arrest of the Apostle. He was denounced as an Ephesian brought into the Temple. \*

Dr. Davidson, in his very sifting argument thinks that on the voyage from Cæsarea to Rome, Trophimus was left sick at Myra, with the intention that he should be sent to Miletus, and when the passage was written, St. Paul believed that he was there. Yet this truly sensible writer supposes that he demands less of conjecture in this, than in imagining a mistake in the writing of one name for another, closely resembling it. A due consideration of all we can find will make us conclude that much the best view is, that Malta was the place where Trophimus was left, on the voyage to Rome.

It is undeniable that this does not remove all difficulty. Why should it be necessary or useful to apprise Timothy of this fact, when during a residence with the Apostle at Rome, it is scarcely conceivable that he was not informed of it?

We answer, can this obscurity which we cannot dissipate—this difficulty which we cannot solve, be comparable to the excessive difficulty of the theory it is adduced to sustain? Is all made clear upon that theory, and the existence of the fact incompatible with any other? Let us reflect upon what it is asserted to prove. St. Paul was liberated from Rome; he went once more over the regions of the East. He was, years after his first visit, at Miletus again, the Miletus of Caria. † He left Trophimus sick there. He returned to Rome. He writes to Timothy telling him of this fact, and writes this to him, when Timothy was at Ephesus, or at least far nearer to Miletus than the Apostle was at Rome. ‡ The solution brings as thick a darkness as that which envelops the difficulty.

It is said (Lange's Introduction) there must have been two imprisonments, because Mark is spoken of in Colossians (iv. 10) as being with St. Paul, and in Second Timothy as being near Timothy, who is requested to bring Mark with him. And so as to Timothy himself, who undoubtedly was there during the first imprisonment, and is now addressed as absent.

\* Acts xxi. v. 29.

† Lange 2 Timothy 118 N. ‡ The distance from Ephesus to Miletus is hardly thirty miles. Conybeare and Howson, N. 214. Lange says Timothy was at Ephesus when this Epistle was written to him.

But on what possible ground must we conclude that either St. Mark or Timothy, clearly with St. Paul during an imprisonment, remained for the whole of its duration with him? We have indisputably two years of imprisonment, and visits may have been made for a short period. And as we have seen, it is shown by the Epistle to the Hebrews, that Timothy was then absent, and he had undoubtedly been present before, uniting in some Epistles.

The historical notices and traditions must be allowed their due weight. They are stated by Conybeare and Howson, and commented upon elaborately by Dr. Davidson. The passage from Eusebius is capable of the construction, that the preaching of St. Paul was limited to Rome. I have examined the translation of Dr. Harmer and of Professor Creuse, 1836. "It is said he was sent upon the ministry of preaching;" or, "he is said to have been sent upon this ministry of preaching." "It is currently reported that the Apostle again went forth to proclaim the Gospel, and afterwards came to Rome a second time, and was martyred under Nero." The passage from Clemens Romanus, written in the second century, and written from Rome to Corinth, is, "St. Paul had preached the Gospel in the East and in the West; that he had instructed the whole world in righteousness; that he had gone to the extremity of the West before his martyrdom."

Spain, it is urged, was known and often spoken of at the extremity of the West.

But Dr. Davidson \* quotes the Greek and translates the passage thus: "Through bigotry, Paul also obtained the reward of patience, after wearing bonds seven times, after being scourged, after being stoned. Having preached the Gospel both in the East and West, he received the reward due to his faith, having taught righteousness to the whole world, and having come to the boundary of the West, and having borne his testimony before the rulers. Thus he departed out of the world." Mr. Tate, one of the advocates of two imprisonments, and long journeys in the interim, excludes Spain from the places visited, and comments upon the above passage of Clemens. He urges that the latter was writing from Rome to the Corinthians at the Eastward. Rome formed their idea of the further West. Spain could hardly be known to them. He

---

\* Vol. II., p. 98.

connects the testimony borne before rulers with the boundary of the West, and his departure from the world; all a continuous reference to one locality, and that necessarily Rome.

Now with this sensible criticism, examine every word of the passage from Clemens, and it is as strictly applicable to the one imprisonment, temporary respite, and death in 64-65, as to a second imprisonment and the protracted interval.

Again, if Eusebius understood Clemens to have referred to Spain as the limit of the West, he never would have spoken of the journey there *as reported*. The authority of Clemens would have been decisive.

St. Chrysostom says, St. Paul, after his residence in Rome, departed to Spain. (Conybeare and Howson.) Paul was dismissed by Nero, that he might preach Christ's Gospel in parts of the West. (St. Jerome, quoted by Conybeare and Howson.)

The passage from the canon of Muratori, also quoted by Conybeare and Howson, is critically analyzed by Davidson, and the very little weight due to it fully shown.

To the Euthalian Edition of Acts is prefixed an Itinerary of the Apostle Paul, in which there is nothing of a second imprisonment. Primasius, a disciple of Augustine, says, in his commentary on Romans, that he had promised indeed to go into Spain, but, in the dispensation of God, did not go.\*

We cannot but be struck with two facts upon these authorities. First, the limit is a journey to Spain—to no other place—and no time of the duration of the visit is assigned. Next, upon dates conceded by nearly all, there would be, from the close of the narrative in Acts, to the time of the fire and persecution, over a year. It is much less improbable that he was permitted to visit Spain during this period, than a release for five years and the journey to Spain and re-visiting most of his former scenes of labor.

But the evidence of history and tradition is singularly weak and insufficient. If the authority of Clemens is out of the way, the tradition is faint of any journey from Rome, and that dim tradition refers only to Spain.

On the other side are some facts of overruling weight. St. Luke was probably with the Apostle when the record of Acts closes.

---

\* Davidson II., 105.

St. Luke was certainly with him when Second Timothy was written, during his imprisonment. There was an interval upon the theory of five years, filled with labors and visits to former scenes and to new fields of labor. Where was St. Luke during that long time, that he has not placed upon record a word as to all these great facts in Apostolic history? He peculiarly undertakes the details of events. And I believe there is not even a tradition of his filling this great void with a word of narrative.

Again, the great mass of the Advocates of the Interval theory agree that First Timothy and Titus were written during this period, at some places he visited.\* Yet there is not a word in either referring to a past imprisonment, and so signal a release, or to any labors as subsequent. The statements in First Timothy are consistent with the lax imprisonment at Cæsarea; and those writers who assign it to the two years at Rome, concede this of course.

Again, Second Timothy is, by all who admit its authenticity, assigned to the time of that imprisonment which was closed by death. The advocates of the Interval theory say, this was as late as A. D. 68, five years after St. Luke ended his history recording the first imprisonment, but, as we sought to prove, not its termination. St. Luke was with him, and yet there is not a sentence from him telling of these intermediate journeys, labors, or events. There is only the shadowy inference from the passage—"at my first trial no one stood by me," on which to build this great superstructure.

It may not be said that the silence of Scripture is an absolute demonstration of the error of a theory upon questions of this nature; but its silence, where we might reasonably expect an utterance, furnishes an argument so powerful, that we must exact irresistible testimony to overthrow the presumption.

Upon no principle of just reasoning—upon no evidence of a satisfactory character, can this Interval theory, in our judgment, be sustained.

We close our remarks upon the Pastoral Epistles with the hope that our rigid adherence to what is found in the Scriptures upon the subject, will be found a surer guide than any other for the solution of the interesting questions discussed.

---

\* See the route by Guerike and by Tate. Davidson, Vol. II., p. 97.

## ART. VI.—THE LIFE AND THE LIGHT.

THE mode of speech, which makes Life the source of Light, is peculiar to St. John. In his Gospel we read, "In Him (Christ) was Life, and the Life was the Light of men." And again, "He that followeth after me shall have the Light of Life." And in his Epistle, "The Life was manifested and we have *seen* it."

The common usage is to reverse the terms, as though we should read, "In Him was Light, and the Light was the Life of men;" as it is often said, in the other Scriptures, that Christ is the "Sun of Righteousness" and the "Light of the world." And this, at first sight, is the natural order of thought. For Light appears to be essential to life, and that is a pale and sickly life that is deprived of its due measure of Light.

Accordingly, we say that Moses is strictly scientific in his account of Creation, when he places first the fiat—"Let there be Light"—before the appearance of the grass and trees and the herbs: and because he brings in the direct sunshine into the world before the creation of the lowest forms of animal life. And we might press the analogy very closely, from the old creation to the new, in the progressive revelation of God to man. The Light of the PROMISE of Christ's coming broke in upon the dark chaos of human sinfulness; and its tradition abode with the inorganic mass of humanity, stirring its dead molecules with a superior life, that rose to its highest development under the "day-dawn" of Judaism: and, when the Sun of Righteousness arose, "new creatures" sprang out of the dust "alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord."

It is true that the dispensations overlap, and it may be objected that the parable is faulty, because we cannot say that there was no true spiritual life in its highest forms, before the birth of Christ, as we can say that there was no true animal life before the sunshine, and no true vegetable life before the light. But, if the objection were never so well taken, we may reply that we never expect to parallel the Spiritual with the Physical, *ad infinitum*. It is enough that things in the earth resemble the things in the heavens.

And the objection is not well taken; because, although human



science may assert with confidence that what we call animal and vegetable life depend upon the light, it cannot assert that there was no such thing as life before the light. For what is Life? Does not its mystery baffle all inquiry? Can the philosopher tell us where vegetable life ends and animal life begins? Can he distinguish with any certainty between organic life of any sort and the activities that inspire inorganic matter? Is not the whole tendency of modern science toward a demonstration that the natural world is a living organism, instinct with subtle energies, that bear the same relation to inorganic matter that life does to organic bodies? And is not the Sun almost known to be the very Source and Fountain of these physical forces, which depend upon its rays as entirely as life does? And, if so,—if the Sun energizes all things with forces appropriate to their several capacities, why should we quarrel with the metaphor that makes Christ the Incarnate Lord, the SUN of Righteousness—inspiring inorganic humanity while it lay in the darkness of heathendom—sustaining the vegetative life of the mass of Judaism—and quickening the mobile and sentient creatures of the Gospel, as the light was manifested, by tradition, by the Abrahamic Covenant, by the Incarnation, one Life pervading all, but with a growing power, and making the Spiritual Creation of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ a unit, and a living unit, as the material world is a unit, instinct with a single force proceeding from the Sun?

2. We have not been wandering from our starting point in showing thus the propriety that resides in the more common Scriptural sequence of these terms, the Life and the Light. Nor have we any thing to unlearn in attempting now to understand St. John's inversion of that sequence. For, in St. John's peculiar wording, we have a hint of a spiritual doctrine of the correlation of forces that may well engage our attention. Nor shall we have any cause to be surprised, if it shall turn out that St. John is as *scientifically* accurate as Moses, when he says of Christ, "In Him was Life, and the Life was the Light of men."

It is a well-understood fact of science that the forces of light, heat, electricity, magnetism, and chemical action, are not material, imponderable substances, pervading the interstices of duller matter, but that they are all diverse manifestations of ONE ENERGY, which flows from the Sun, as from an exhaustless fountain. You

may convert any one of these manifestations into any other. You can measure light in units of heat, and heat in units of electricity, and so on through the circle of physical forces. Hence it is as accurate to say that the heat is the light of the world, as to say that the light is the heat of the world. The terms are convertible, because the forces are convertible.

But there is one force that cannot be ignored, that will not come into the category,—the *vis viva* or force of physical life, which, while it seems to be related to all the rest, and to be inseparable from them, cannot be brought under their laws, but exhibits arbitrary phenomena of its own.

It has been the dream of philosophers for ages to identify this life-force with the other physical forces; and the recent discoveries of the unity of all forces have sometimes made it seem not impossible that science would yet succeed in isolating and examining physical life, as we see from Professor Huxley's recent lecture. And yet, again, the discovery seems as remote as ever. There is an evident *relation* between life and light, and heat and electricity, but it is not the *same* relation that exists between these, among themselves. On the contrary, the living being alone can originate all these forces, and corresponds rather to the Sun itself, than to any effects of the Sun's rays. Life seems to be rather the parent than the child of force; and what if it should hereafter appear that the Sun is the centre and fountain of this mysterious life-force, and that all these sensible phenomena which we call forces are only effects of that VITAL ENERGY? Would not this be a great and glorious parable of the remarkable inversion of terms which St. John employs? and would it not be grand to see Revelation again leading the Sciences, her handmaidens, up to a recognition of the true solution of the philosopher's notion of a soul of the universe, when it shall appear that, eighteen hundred years ago, she wrote it in a Book contrary to all human science, until now, "In Him was Life, and the LIFE WAS THE LIGHT?"

Thus, if ever, it would seem, must Science discover the mystery of physical life, not by resolving or converting it into light, or heat, or magnetism, but by identifying it with the solar energy, which produces all these phenomena, and so proving that LIFE is the source of LIGHT, and that it is as true of the physical Sun as of the Spiritual—In it is physical Life, and the Life is the Light. And

then, if the earth and all that is in it be instinct with one Life, manifesting itself in every creature and thing, 'after his kind,' we get a new significance from all those Scriptures, which personify the 'inanimate creation,' as we call it, and can understand the power of St. Paul's words, that 'the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain, waiting for redemption.'"

There is no infidel materialism in this view; for, though we should entirely resolve the mystery of physical life, not only in its identification with the mystery of the solar energy, but in the solution of that mystery itself, we should not then have unveiled the higher mystery of spiritual life, but only paralleled it. Science and Revelation can never clash, because they regard different circles of truth; albeit, concentric circles. Nor is there any Pantheism here; for though we should admit the ancient notion of a soul of the universe, it would be but a physical soul of the physical universe, and would not touch the Christian doctrine of the "Father of Spirits." Nor is there any more of Pantheism in the one case than in the other; for there is a point where Pantheism and Revelation agree, as we find St. Paul quoting the heathen Aratus on Mar's hill. "For in Him we live, and move, and have our being; as certain also of your own poets have said; for we are also His offspring." The disagreement between Pantheism and Revelation lies in their respective conclusions; and what can be more antagonistic than the Pantheistic conceit of a final absorption into Brahma, and the Christian doctrine of the Judgment Seat of Christ? Pantheism destroys all Personality, while Revelation magnifies it.

There is no scientific reason why we should not believe that St. John puts terms in their true, *natural* order, when he makes LIFE the source of LIGHT rather than its effect.

3. And this opens up another step in our progress. For it must be evident we have not told the whole truth in saying that the physical world about us is a *parable* of the spiritual. It must be something more than a parable. If it were only a parable, then it could be disjoined from its interpretation and considered separately; and the too frequent divorce of Science from Religion would be excusable. A man might be a Persian and a Zoroastrian in his science without detriment to his Christianity. Christ might be left out of the physical creation, and the Sun installed in His place, as the Fountain of our physical life and sustenance.

There must be some unity more than that of correspondence between the world of matter and the world of spirit which shall justify St. Paul's words to the Colossians, that "In Him (Christ) ALL THINGS consist." There must be some means by which these physical types and images of things in the heavens are energized by the Divine Word or Logos, the Eternal Son; and so made, not original fountains and streams of physical life, but secondary causes and instruments for the conveyance of the Divine Life. We must regard the Sun not as אור light, but, כסא, the receptacle of light. We must conceive of the two worlds of matter and spirit after the manner of the son of Sirach: "All things are double, one against another" (Eccles. xlii. 24), and "So look upon all the works of the Most High, and there are two and two, one against another." (Eccles. xxxiii. 15.) In a word, we must conceive of the physical world as a sacrament of the spiritual, that Christ may be discerned therein, conveying Himself mystically, by the sunshine, to plant, and beast, and man, and to the "inanimate" creation, for the sustentation of their physical life, as He conveys Himself, in the Covenant of His Church, to our souls and bodies, to preserve them unto everlasting life.

What may have been the original provision of God to ensure this dependence of all things on Christ, the Eternal Word, we cannot presume to say. We see its exponent in the Tree of Life, which stood "in the midst of the garden," and was so jealously guarded by the cherubim, after man's transfiguration. But we have no difficulty in determining what is God's appointment for the *restoration* of that dependence of all things on Christ which had been destroyed by sin, to the confusion and ruin of the world, and of man, its heir.

There was no delay on God's part. The PROMISE of Christ's Incarnation was announced in the hour of man's fall; and it was a living promise and an effectual light-giving life to man and all his world, from the first, as truly as the dawn-light is an effectual promise of the meridian sun, wakening the whole creation to activity.

And the manner of the recovery of the physical and spiritual world to Christ was as expressive of the truths which we have been considering as can possibly be conceived. We say, Christ took our nature upon Him, and we say truly. But in taking our nature, He took "of the dust of the ground" as well; and His Incarna-

tion was a glorious marriage of God with Nature, as a recovered Bride,—recovered, too, with infinite love and mercy, out of the harlotry of sin, as Ezekiel testifies; and purged, and sanctified, and restored, so that that which was Born to us was indeed “That Holy Thing.”

The Incarnation of the Son of God, therefore, restores the dependence of all things on Christ; and by it *all* physical things are sanctified as vehicles and channels of God to us; so that we may glorify Him, “whether we eat, or drink, or whatever we do,” and glorify Him in our bodies, as well as in our spirits.

That Incarnation brought new life into a dead and chaotic world, because in the Word made flesh was life, energizing suns and sacraments in nature and in grace, and making Christ Jesus the LIGHT OF THE WORLD, the Bread of Life, the Rock of Living Water, the only Communicator of vitality, in whom we live, and move, and have our being; without whom we have no Life in us.

Hence it is not likely that the mystery of physical life is scientifically discoverable. It is a fact of Theology, not of Science. It is wrapped up and contained in the mystery of the Incarnation of the Son of God, which was “a mystery wrought in the silence of God,” and only announced, not explained, but announced to the wondering choirs of angels by the birth in Bethlehem. But the *fact* of a Life-force pervading the physical universe stands out as one of the immediate discoveries of science yet to be demonstrated. And so the fact of the all-reaching, all-touching, all-pervading, all-quickenings power of the Incarnate Word is written upon every page of Inspiration, and lies at the root of our Christian faith. It is a fact that is not limited and contained within the Church. For Christ is “the Light that lighteneth every man that cometh into the world.” And as Bishop Andrews says,

“Every green thing in nature was the better for His Incarnation. ‘He upholdeth all things by the Word of His Power.’ He restores earth to its original uses, so that He could take of the Passover Bread, while He was yet uncrucified, and say of it, ‘This is my Body,’ identifying not that particular Bread with that particular substance of flesh, but Himself with all man’s sustenance and life. Sanctifying, not Jordan only, but ‘the element of water’—*all waters*, as the old Liturgies have it—to the mystical washing away of sin; and the final issue of His manifestation in the flesh shall be Paradise regained, and man’s restoration to it, and to the Tree of Life. And thus, since His Incarnation, in which He took on Him not human nature only, but all nature, (the dust of the ground), the whole creation is turned

to sacramental uses, and, in a measure, endued with sacramental power. And all who do but see the light, or eat of the fruit of the ground, or drink of the water of any fountain, hold sacramental communion with Christ, receive Christ, to their health or to their destruction, after a similar though an inferior mystery to that which is enacted in His Church, where truly, and most truly, 'our fellowship is with the Father and with His Son Jesus Christ.'"

If, then, Christ be the Life of men, He is also and therefore the Light of men.

If there be no inward LIFE in man other than that which he derives from the Incarnation, then there is no inward LIFE in man other than the Light of Christ, "who is our Life."

As a syllogism, it stands thus :

The LIFE is the only source of LIGHT.

Christ is the only LIFE of men ; therefore,

Christ is the only LIGHT of men.

And, inductively, thus :

Christ is our LIFE.

Where Christ is, the Father is.

Where the Father and the Son are, there is the Spirit, proceeding.

Where the Spirit is, there is LIGHT.

And where the LIGHT of God is, there is no superfluous candle of natural light.

In other words, man has no such thing as a conscience apart from Christ. Christ is man's inward monitor, advising and prompting by His Spirit "Every man that cometh into the world."

It is necessary here to define terms, and that somewhat at length :—

Man is a triplex being, consisting of BODY, SOUL and SPIRIT. Yet he is a Trinity—a unit.

His BODY is endued with appetites and instincts. His SOUL is endued with passions and judgment, or reason. His SPIRIT is endued with affections and—we commonly say, Conscience. It is proposed to say CHRIST. There is a close analogy and likeness between these three parts of human nature.

The appetites and instincts of the body answer to and resemble the passions and judgment of the soul. The passions and judgment of the soul answer to and resemble the affections and conscience of the spirit. Thus, love is a fleshly instinct, an intellectual passion,



a spiritual affection. And so closely are the three "loves" allied, that we have no separate terms by which to distinguish them without adjectives.

Moreover, it is hard to distinguish practically in any manner; for the three overlap upon one another, and blend one with another inextricably.

The physical instincts of brutes are rational, within certain limits. The reason of a savage heathen is spiritual in its higher reaches; not actually, but apparently and approximately.

The physical instincts, in men and beasts alike, distinguish and obey, or violate, the dictates of propriety, which is the moral code of Reason. The classification of clean and unclean beasts, in the Levitical Law, is founded upon this difference of physical behaviour and character. The dove and the swine are the extremes of physical purity and impurity; modesty and immodesty.

So the rational soul, by entertaining considerations of propriety and shamefacedness, repeats, in its way, the spiritual faculty of discerning good from evil. The Reason, as such, has nothing to do with Moral Science, except to understand it. And, yet, it is, practically, impossible to separate intellectual and moral philosophy, without doing violence to man's deepest cravings and most clamorous necessities.

What the sense of sin is to the *spirit*, the sense of shame is to the *soul* and the consciousness of nakedness is to the *body*.

Man rises in the scale of his being, as his soul acquires dominion over his body, and sinks in the scale of his being as his body acquires the mastery over his soul. He rises to his highest elevation when his flesh and his passions are subdued to his spirit, and sinks to his deepest degradation when his spirit and his reason are given up to minister to his fleshly lusts.

So true is this, that the most temporary and accidental exaltation of one part of his nature is ennobling, or degrading, as the case may be. A man who is, very slightly, intoxicated will do shameless, and, even, brutal things, from which his reason would, ordinarily, suffice to restrain him. And a man, under strong mental excitement, will do sinful things, from which he would, ordinarily, shrink, with horror; while a man whose affections are wholly set and fastened upon things above will curb his passions and "keep under" his body.

And, as habitual indulgence in carnal and passionate pleasure degrades, by fastening a habit of submission upon the spirit, until a man has no more strength nor will to resist and reform, so a habit of self-discipline and austerity ennobles, by strengthening the higher nature to maintain and preserve its rightful supremacy, beyond the limits of the exercise.

A man who is ruled by his bodily instincts is a savage, or a brute, according to his circumstances and opportunities,

A man who is ruled by his reason and his passion is a civilized citizen, or an outlaw, according to his intent and purpose of life.

A man who is ruled by his spirit is a child of God, or, failing that, a devil. For, when the human spirit deliberately rejects Christ, Satan enters into it, as we learn from the case of Judas—and, even more plainly, from that warning parable of the return of the unclean spirit to his house, that was empty, swept and garnished.

When, therefore, we speak of Conscience, we must not confound it with any physical, or intellectual faculty, though both these mimic Conscience, as it were. For a man may be utterly devoid of Conscience, and, yet, be shamefaced and decorous, and a man may have cast propriety to the winds, and, yet, avoid the extremes of carnal indulgence, through the instincts of self-preservation.

The first effect of true religion as a civilizer is, to teach man to cover his nakedness. Its next reach is, to make him careful of propriety. Its last is, to make him *pure*.

Now, there is but one instant, in the history of our race, in which we can study man in a state of utter separation from the indwelling Christ, and that is the moment of what is aptly termed the FALL, when man's spiritual being fell away from the union with Christ, its Life, and received the sentence of death in itself.

In that moment, when man was without Life, he was, also, without Light.

No one can read the brief account in Genesis without being impressed with the fact of the entire absence from Adam of any *sense of sin*. His answer to the voice of the Lord God is the answer of a self-confident equal, taken at an overwhelming disadvantage. "I heard Thy voice, and I was afraid, because I was naked, and I hid myself."

There is the instinctive *physical* impulse seeking a covering.

"They sewed fig-leaves together, and made themselves aprons." These are the *rational* impulses of fear and shame. But there is not a word of consciousness of *sin*, nor of repentance. The theory of Irenæus, and others, that the aprons of fig leaves were put on as a symbol of penitence sounds like a theory after the fact. Both Adam and his wife appear as intelligent brutes, conscious of having given offence, and expectant of retribution, but utterly devoid of any perception of guiltiness, and, equally, of any emotion of penitence.\*

All nobleness and dignity disappear in them, and the physical instinct of self-preservation, and the rational passion of selfishness, alone, govern their conduct. Adam excuses himself by accusing his wife; his wife accuses the Serpent. The Serpent, himself, is a nobler animal than they, in that he receives his doom in silence.

That man was, at that moment, lost to Christ, and Christ to him, is touchingly intimated in that cry of the voice of the Lord God, "Adam, where art thou?" It was the voice of man's beloved saying: "Open to me, my sister, my love, my dove." It is Christ, seeking His Bride, our nature, as in Solomon's Song.

That Adam, apart from Christ, was without conscience of sin, is farther shown by the nature of the Lord's challenge, "Who told thee that thou wast naked?" Referring Adam to the memory of his former dependence upon Christ in purity, when "they were both naked, the man and his wife, and were not ashamed."

"The eyes of them both had been opened," but by a new teacher. There is no appeal to Adam's conscience, but only to his memory. God does not charge him with sin, but with shame and nakedness. He addresses Himself to the rational animal, before Him, and not to man's spiritual affections or perceptions.

Now this is the only practical example of what man is, apart from Christ, that we can possibly have, and, as it exhibits man under the influence of death, so it exhibits him as walking in *darkness*. Deprived of the *LIFE* of Christ, he is, also, without *LIGHT*. He discerns nothing, beyond a vague consciousness of impending retribution, for a rational transgression. He manifests nothing, beyond an instinctive effort at self-preservation and self-covering.

---

\* For incidental confirmation of this view see Ellicott's *Destiny of the Creature*—"Death."

In losing Christ, he has lost his Conscience. He retains his spiritual faculties as a form. But the Light that was their soul, and guided their exercise, is put out within him; they teach him nothing, they guide him nowhere. He falls back upon his lower nature for direction and guidance—his body, with its instincts;—his soul, with its passions,—*until* the WORD OF THE PROMISE, the quickening, inspiring, regenerating WORD restores Christ to him. Then his spiritual affections, which have been sitting, helplessly, in the dark, arise and grasp Christ, by faith. Adam becomes, again, a man with a Conscience. He acquires a capacity of repenting, a disposition to recover himself, and he betakes himself to sacrificial and atoning acts, as by a spiritual instinct.

Volumes have been written concerning the origin of sacrifices; long and labored treatises to show that they were of divine appointment,—that the “coats of skins,” with which the Lord God clothed Adam and his wife, were skins of beasts, slain for the first sacrifice. And there is no objection to these arguments; indeed, they are necessary to this very doctrine of Conscience. But they only tell a half-truth. The commandment to offer sacrifice would have taken no deeper hold upon man’s obedience than the commandment to abstain from flesh—food, if it had been nothing but a positive commandment,—if it had not found an echo and recognition in the deeper recesses of man’s spiritual being, illuminated, now, by the Life-giving PROMISE. Whatever else man afterward failed of performing, he never failed of sacrificial acts. Whether he sacrificed to devils or to God, he, perpetually, sacrificed. It is the instinct of a nature, restored to consciousness and perception, that has discerned its own sinfulness, and seeks to deprecate, to propitiate, to make satisfaction for its own deficiencies, by offering of its best; being ready to give “its first-born for its transgression, the fruit of its body for the sin of its soul.” It is continually asking, “Will the Lord be pleased with thousands of rams, or with ten thousands of rivers of oil?” It asks the same question, it seeks the same end, in Jew and Gentile, alike. The fact of sacrifices, as it is an objective monument to the truth of Revelation, is, also, a subjective witness to the regeneration of man by the Word of the PROMISE restoring Christ to him. The instant man is “made alive again unto God, through Jesus Christ our Lord,” he begins to move in sympathy with the Divine purpose. He resorts to the

same device, for putting away sin, that God has fore-ordained from the foundation of the world. He does it, not only obediently, under a commandment, but, instinctively, when the commandment is forgotten. He catches a shadowy glimpse of God's perception of the nature of sin, and its only remedy. He resorts, always and everywhere, to the substituted victim—the substituted life—for reconciliation and satisfaction. He anticipates the sacrifice of Calvary—with pious, reverent, intelligent faith, seeking a spotless lamb, an unyoked heifer, a male without blemish; or, with ignorant zeal, offering swine's flesh and 'unclean beasts, or, with horrible and frightful burlesque, offering human life itself—but, always, anticipating Calvary, according to his privileges and his knowledge, and his will to serve God.

Now, if CONSCIENCE be of any value as a monitor, it must discern the same distinctions of right and wrong that God discerns, and if the sense of sin in man be the reflection of God's hatred of sin, the sacrificial instinct in man is the reflection of God's purpose of destroying sin by the sacrifice of His Son, and we have identified the most enduring and indelible dictate of Conscience, with the grandest and most central purpose of God, in man's creation, the destruction of sin by sacrifice.

Christ indwelling in Human Nature as the LIFE of men is also the LIGHT of men. Coming to do God's will, to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself, He suffuses man's spiritual being with the sacrificial instinct. Man not only discerns right from wrong, sin from holiness, but resorts to the fore-ordained remedy against sin. Christ, the Lamb slain, is the sacrifice. The indwelling of Christ in man is the subjective origin of sacrifice. The universality of sacrifice is the evidence that Christ has taken hold on man's *nature*, in its original elements, and not simply on the personal being of individual men. The history of sacrifice is the history of crucified Christ striving in human nature to accomplish His One, Full, Perfect, and Sufficient Sacrifice, oblation and satisfaction, of Himself once offered, and never finding a fit instrument until the hour of His Incarnation in the womb of the Blessed Virgin.

And, if man in the dreadful hour of his Fall from Christ were without a Conscience, and if, in the first moment of his restoration by the Word of the Promise, he displayed the highest conceivable Conscience; one that not only discerned God's distinction between

sin and holiness, but grasped also at God's provision for the destruction of sin and the triumph of holiness, we have the strongest warrant for concluding that the human Conscience is no independent power, but the indwelling Christ, and that the Life is the Light and the only Light of men.

And to this agree the Scriptures, which, while they recognize the fact of the existence of a spiritual Life in man, ascribe it to Christ, "By whom all things consist;" which, while they recognize a spiritual Light in man, ascribe it to the Spirit of Christ; which, while they recognize virtue in man, call it "the fruit of the Spirit." There were love, joy, peace in the world before Pentecost. But love, joy, peace—whatsoever things are pure, lovely, and of good report—are the fruit of the Spirit, always, everywhere. "There is none that doeth good of himself."

We have put one side of the truth strongly, and without qualification. We shall present the "counter-truth" in another paper—the relation of the Inward Light to the outward revelation. The distinction between Christ pervading our nature and Christ manifested to our personal consciousness and faith is the distinction which disciples of the Inward Light invariably overlook. Life is more than the source of Light; it is the source of all *power*, of all force. Christ must be regarded objectively as the Sun of Righteousness before we comprehend salvation. He is in us, but He is also out of us. He pervades us, but He is also revealed to us.

---

#### ART. VII.—THE LITERATURE OF THE AGE OF REVOLUTIONS.

THE Literature of the eighteenth century was outward and finite:—outward in the absence of a deep penetration into the heart and mind of man; and finite in its subjects, and the arbitrary laws of style and verse to which it was confined. A philosophy of sensualism, a morality of expediency, and a poetry of fancy and "creamy smoothness," characterized the age. Instead of the untutored melody of the nightingale, the music of its poets was the measured cadence of an opera singer. Now and then some caged bird, like Goldsmith, fluttering against its bars, uttered a few sweet notes of nature, but as the poor thing was either vapid or



unheard, its voice soon sank into silence. Literature was slumbering on a bed of down, and the French Revolution, like a thunder-storm, awoke it to action. The clouds had been gathering for years, the atmosphere had grown thick, and the calm began which invariably precedes the convulsion of the elements. Nor was it a local sirocco, which affected only a small section of country, but a tempest that overspread the whole heavens, and shook with its violence the combined nations of Europe. It bore around the world the cry of the people for reason and liberty—for a freedom from unequal taxation, from the tyranny of a privileged aristocracy, from a debased clergy and a feeble and licentious monarchy. The philosophy of the Encyclopedists had encouraged a desire for what was called the primitive state of society. The public press called for equality and the rights of man. The people, demanding vengeance, rebelled and conquered. One after another, the middling and commercial classes of England rose into importance. Slavery was abolished. The nobility, driven from the battlements, retired to the citadel, and became at once more exclusive and more desirous of reform, and the condition of the agricultural poor was searched into and alleviated. On all sides the cry went up, "The man must have his due."

It is this victory of humanity which makes a unity out of all the diverse elements of the French Revolution, and constitutes the essential point of departure between the literature of the eighteenth and the nineteenth centuries.

It is our aim to show that the growth of a democracy which was so marvellously promoted by the French Revolution has been the source of all the various currents of our literature. It gave, in the first place, an impetus to every popular mode of thought, to every popular form of expression, and to every popular variety of knowledge. In the language of Shelley, "The most unfailing herald, companion and follower of the awakening of a great people to work a beneficial change in opinion or institution, is Poetry." It is Poetry which teaches the attributes of humanity, the sensibilities, the imagination, the inner recesses of the soul, rather than the reasoning powers or the discursive understanding; and never were these regions more thoroughly surveyed or more lovingly studied than during the thirty years immediately succeeding the French Revolution.

The field also of the Novel, or poetic prose, which is more than all others the people's property, became enlarged; the plot was more finely developed, the language chastened, and the lists entered by such a multitude of authors as was never known before. Beginning with *Waverley*, it rose to an influence second to no variety of literature, and, under the veil of amusement, became a vehicle for communicating the highest religious truths, the finest affections, and the brightest perceptions of the mind.

The first effect of raising man from his degradation was a withdrawal of thought from the court to the lower grades of society, and thence to animated but irrational nature.

Wordsworth said of his own poems that "humble and rustic life was generally chosen, because in that condition the passions of the heart find a better soil in which they can attain their maturity,—are less under restraint, and speak a plainer and more emphatic language; and because in that condition of life the passions are incorporated with the beautiful and permanent forms of existence."

Man, for what he was himself, for his inborn dignity, for what his great Creator had given him, became the universal theme of Poetry. Compare any of the representative minds of this period with those of the preceding century, and the difference is manifest. There is no regard for humanity in Pope or Dryden. They are in court ruffles, with all the elegance and formality of the ball room. They never look at any common man except with the coldness of an affected sympathy. The authors of the *Lyrical Ballads*, on the other hand, of the *Sibylline Leaves*, and even the melancholy Keats and Shelley, breathe a different atmosphere. The misanthropic Byron also, caring for no one but himself, is forced by the fashion of his age to pass a beautiful tribute to man and liberty in the *Prisoner of Chillon*. And at the extreme end of the pole. Crabbe, with a theory that is open to criticism, has made verses out of the filth of the workshop and the horrors of the dungeon.

Outward and inward nature are so closely allied, that in all schools of Poetry the two are co-existent.

"Enraptured art draws from those sacred springs  
Streams that reflect the poetry of things."

During the first part of this century the world was upturned for its wealth of beauty and imagery. The lake, the brook, the moun-

tain, the tiniest flower of the wayside, became subjects for the verses of enraptured poets. It was a noble revival in Poetry—one that opened a grand field of thought, of sentiment, and of deep spiritual lessons.

Apart from the wit and brilliancy which may be embodied in it, the very essence of Poetry consists, as Jeffrey writes, "In the fine perception and vivid expression of that subtle and mysterious analogy which exists between the physical and moral world—which makes outward things and qualities the natural types and emblems of inward gifts and emotions; or leads us to ascribe life and sentiment to every thing that interests us in the aspects of external nature."

But however true this theory, and in spite of its beautiful expression, the results are dangerous, and the grounds of those who closely follow it, treacherous.

No one appreciated the natural world more than Shakspeare, and he has never fallen into Pantheism,—but almost the entire literature of the nineteenth century is imbued with it. Traces of it are found in such lines of Pope as those beginning,

"Vital spark of heavenly flame,"

but it became extinct, until the philosophy of the Revolution and an excessive, absorbing, love of nature, brought it into new life. It can be perceived gradually growing from such expressions as "mingling in the universe," and the frequent apostrophes to natural objects, and personifications, to the open avowal of Tennyson in his last poem. Such words as the following, written by the Christian poet, Wordsworth, would never have been found fifty years before his day:

"Whate'er exists hath properties that spread  
Beyond itself, communicating good,  
A simple blessing, or with evil mixed;  
Spirit that knows no insulated spot,  
No chasm, no solitude; from link to link  
It circulates, the Soul of all the World."

The rights of man, and the tenets of socialism maintained by the French Revolution, having in them that which encouraged vanity and individualism, led to the ego-ism and subjectiveness of this era. For when a man's thoughts are concentrated upon himself by some idea of personal and inviolate right, the evils which

have been mentioned almost invariably arise. While sympathizing with all that is good and great in our country and age, we must yet confess they have become a distinguishable feature of American life, and have penetrated all forms of thought and expression in our century. In these days men consider things from their own standpoints, or from the peculiarities of their own disposition. Byron looked at the dreadful, sinning side of man, Keats at the melancholy, and Wordsworth at his tender, religious nature. The majority of our critics, like Jeffrey, in his review of the *Excursion*, never put themselves in the author's place, but judge according to their peculiar turn of thinking. There is none of that universality of Shakspeare which grasps the whole of his subject with the impartial hand of a great Genius. We can expect no encouragement for the Drama in such an age; for the Drama is essentially objective in its character, and does not admit of that introspective treatment which Talfourd, Coleridge, Byron and others have given it.

The convulsion and confusion of society produced by the conflict between men and noblemen during the Revolution—the overthrow of everything ancient—the exaltation of reason in strange union with passion, combined with the loose speculations of French philosophers, reflected upon many English minds a spirit of skepticism, and developed a poetry of fancy and sensuality. It was a school which led captive the weak minds of poetasters and the young, a school of elegant libertinism which attacked with its filthy arrows the Deity himself. The examples which would best illustrate its sentiments would only deface our pages.

But the violence of that mighty movement which upturned the subsoil of the mind and left men thinking and loving, is over, and the final results of a democratic literature are showing themselves.

Literature has ceased to be centralized, and in close communion with the benefits at first derived from it, and the elevation of an intelligent public, has led to manifest evils. To use the forcible metaphor of Coleridge, "During the days of Chaucer and Gower our language might be compared to a wilderness of vocal reeds, from which the favorites only of Pan and Apollo could construct even the rude *syrix*, and from this the constructors only could elicit strains of music. But now, partly by the labors of successive

poets, and in part by the more artificial state of society and social intercourse, language, mechanized, as it were, into a barrel-organ, supplies both instrument and music."

The people are surface judges; they are most often as contented with an egg-shell as with an egg. The poetry for the populace is a poetry of fancy and sensibility; and the prose consists chiefly in exciting or amusing subjects, illustrated by bright metaphors, tender, humorous and sparkling wit. We are not surprised, in such an age, at a greedy devouring of short essays, heart-rending novels, sensational histories, trashy biographies, and ravings about spiritualism, orthodoxy, religion, and everything of this sort.

We can look for little pure and classical prose,—such as is found in the days of Addison, and in poetry, the universal tendency of democracy to lawlessness was shown from the very beginning of the era in the absence of the elegant and strictly accurate lines of such poets as Pope and his contemporaries.

The distaste of the masses for learning has in it two opposite effects. It causes either an entire neglect of reading, as was generally the case among the early writers of this century—a fact which has lessened the durability of their works—or else as we find at the present time, authors become mere memorizers, instead of searchers after truth.

In this antipathy to thorough knowledge can be traced the reaction against the constant allusions made during the eighteenth century to the Greek and Latin authors. Yet, as respects our language, with the assistance of the renewed interest taken in the Elizabethan Literature, it has worked a favorable change, by restoring to its proper position the Saxon element, which is essentially the people's tongue.

What can we expect of *philosophy* during an age like the present?

When profundity is so much decried the soul of profundity is assailed with the choicest popular weapons, as being visionary and unpractical. Philosophy is engaged chiefly in discovering the errors of former writers, rather than in bringing to light any new truth.

The sensualism of Locke was overthrown by the shock it received from the Revolution, and by the study of the German school, and the restoration of the English Church to new power.

But no sooner had the spiritual philosophy taken its place than the impulse given to science introduced Positivism, which now ranks first in the latest history of philosophy and is handed from periodical to periodical of our literature.

In history, however, for other reasons, we find a different result. The Revolution gave such a shock to all society and government that a renewed interest was shown in these matters, and the archives of nations were explored to their farthest corner. Moreover, a democratic age, by permitting greater political privileges to the people, encourages in them the desire for a knowledge of the principles of government, and the fate of different national politics. If history in the present century has not the dignity and deep learning of Gibbon, or the chaste language of Hume, it can boast of the accurate detail of Hallam, the critical powers of Motley, and the elegant Saxon style and brilliant descriptions of Froude.

For the discussion, however, of historical events, and for the criticism of society, morals and literature, the usual form of composition is the Review, which from the beginning of the century has afforded a channel for communicating the deepest thought, the brightest fancies, and noblest sentiments of the age. Perhaps nothing illustrates more clearly the influence of the people upon our literature than the birth of the Review. It has called forth an elegant and brilliant style. Its varied subjects, its short articles, and its periodical publication correspond exactly to all the requirements of a popular taste.

The diffusion of knowledge which has led to a multiplication of books, while it undermines the sources of originality, draws the attention to a great diversity of objects and vaporizes the mental powers. It has introduced upon the stage of literature a countless multitude of authors, among whom woman has played her part with a prominence which was unknown before the Revolution.

This multitudinous crowd of writers, pushing each other aside, and striving for the topmost place in the public favor, has degraded learning to a trade, and is aiming its blows at every pure and exalted sentiment left us. The books which it publishes are utilitarian in their views and foster the germs of that materialism which is so prevalent an evil in our recent literature.

It is the practical which such men call for, in these days of



practical railroads, practical telegraphs, and practical manufactories. The result is a skepticism about truths which cannot be explained by natural laws. It has produced such writers as Martin Jewitt, Baden Powell and the contributors to the Westminster Review, who have attacked with their arguments revelation, the Church, and the Creator Himself.

It must not be considered that of all the unlimited peculiarities, the discordant elements, the astounding advances and degradations of the literature of this era, the democratic spirit of the French Revolution was the one moving cause. Its influence has been shown in leading to a greater love of mankind and of nature, in producing a philosophy of Pantheism and materialism, in causing a subjective method of thought, and, finally, in debasing thorough culture and originality. Other forces, however, such as the German school of learning, have powerfully affected the century; but the popular movement seems to have been the interpenetrative spirit of every conspicuous advantage or injury which has followed the eighteenth century. It is the type-form of all those varieties of style and subject which are scattered over the literary world, and, as the years go on, the hidden corners of our literature are all illuminated by that central light of the Revolution—the freedom of the people.

---

#### ART. VIII.—ITALIAN UNIVERSITIES.

BEFORE proceeding to the immediate subject of this Article we propose to trace briefly the rise of European Universities. Their origin must be referred to the twelfth century. The first Crusade had proved the cause of an unusual intellectual excitement. Its result was the introduction into Europe of Oriental learning, and more especially the treasures of Arabian scholarship. Cathedral and monastic institutions of course dated much earlier, and here we may remark that the original application of the word University has been often mistaken. In Bishop Coppleston's reply to the calumnies of the Edinburgh Review respecting Oxford, it has been inferred that he took a University to signify a number of colleges united into a single corporation. The passage quoted does not support the conclusion. Again, the term has been considered

to imply simply a place of universal learning, as stated by the Dean of Durham in his history of the Church, and as previously taught by Mosheim. In this view, while the Academy confined its instruction to particular branches of science, the University embraced the whole circle of learning. But this, as Mr. Malden observes, is a mere quibble upon the word. In the language of the Civil Law all corporations were called *Universities*, as forming a whole out of many individuals. By this application of the word to the teachers and learners of the University of Paris, as probably made by Pope Innocent the Third, they were recognized as forming an organized body, and not merely an assemblage of individuals. There is an instrument of earlier date, in the reign of King John, A. D. 1201, in which the term is applied to Oxford. It came subsequently to be restricted to places of general education where degrees were conferred. These centres of learning originated in the voluntary efforts of scholars who began to lecture in different cities, and on various branches of knowledge, and thereby attracted around them many pupils. Thus, in a short account of the University of Padua it is mentioned that the "Studio" commenced in schools taught by masters having no public authority. Professors increased in numbers and reputation. Students multiplied. The "Studio" became famous. A University was the result. Other institutions of the period had, most probably, a similar history.

The faculty of Arts was evidently the most ancient department of the old Universities, while other and higher studies were soon superadded. Paris became distinguished for Theology; Bologna for Law; Salerno for Medicine. The custom of conferring degrees seems to have arisen at the first of these celebrated institutions. In the beginning, as stated in an epistle of Abelard, whoever considered himself to have made sufficient progress in learning, if only he could attract an audience, took upon himself to expound the books of the Old and New Testaments. As might have been foreseen, many became lecturers who were ignorant of the very elements of Divinity. To remedy this evil, theological teachers of higher reputation united themselves into a society, and established a rule that no one should teach without their sanction. This led to a public examination of the candidates, and a formal ceremony of induction. Early in the thirteenth century a similar

arrangement prevailed in the Faculty of Arts. A reform appears to have been carried into the University of Paris by Innocent the Third. One of the regulations made by this Pope provided that no one should read, or lecture in Arts who had not been a hearer for six years, and passed a formal examination. It was also enjoined that candidates for this privilege must be more than twelve years of age, which seems to show that in those days the nursery and the University were sometimes brought into close contact.

It soon followed that degrees were conferred after regular examinations in all the Faculties, and Nicholas the Fourth, who was Pope from 1287 to 1294, granted the University of Paris that persons who had been approved there as Doctors should have the right to teach and lecture, and direct public schools in all other places. To obtain similar privileges in all Universities the Papal confirmation had to be solicited. It was only as legate of Rome that the Archbishop of Canterbury, before the Reformation, possessed the power of conferring degrees. When the authority of the Vatican had been thrown off, Cranmer informed Gardiner of his intention to make a visitation as metropolitan, and was denied the right by that Bishop of Winchester, until authorized by an act of Parliament.

At the beginning of the fourteenth century the commencing doctors were in the habit of indulging in great ostentation and expense when admitted to their degrees. To correct this evil Pope Clement the Fifth published an edict of the Council of Vienna. The excess arose, as we infer, from the entertainments the candidate was expected to give, from the necessity of providing a gown and robe of ermine for himself, with gown, cap, and ring for the Bishop and each of the doctors whom he had selected to present him for his degree, and also gloves for the other doctors, and similar expenses.

The whole system of degrees seems to have originated at Paris, as might have been expected from its venerable antiquity. This view is confirmed by the use of the word *bachelor*, which was everywhere employed to designate the lowest degree bestowed by each Faculty, and appears to have been peculiar to the feudal, or military law of France. The knight *bachelor* was distinguished from the knight *banneret*, who had the right to unfurl his banner, and who not only was arrayed in arms himself, but, through the

greatness of his possessions, or reputation, brought followers into the field. On the contrary, the former simply provided for himself, and the moderate estate necessary for his equipment was called a *baccalare*, whence the term *baccalarius*, with its academical use, was taken metaphorically, and indicated a graduate of the lowest rank. The titles *Master*, *Doctor*, *Professor* were originally identical, signifying, according to their obvious meaning, persons engaged in teaching. However, in process of time, the first became appropriated to instructors in the liberal Arts; the second to those in Theology and Law; and the last to lecturers on some particular subject.

Licentiates were not entitled to lecture without permission from the Rector of the University, and this permission was sometimes accorded to simple scholars after diligent study for five or six years, for which, however, a fee had to be paid proportionate to the magnitude of the department. At Padua Bachelors of Law or Medicine were created by a Doctor or Master, without the intervention of any public authority. The Licentiates did not differ from Doctors except in the fact that they were not entitled to the gown. In the year 1656 a regulation was made to mark the merit of graduates, that if a degree was not obtained by the unanimous consent of the Faculty, the fact should be stated in the diploma, which was to be drawn up in a less honorable form, and written on paper instead of parchment. This regulation occasioned in the year following the death of a lecturer on the theory of medicine, Guido Antonio Albanese, a man of noble rank, who was assassinated. His murderer was publicly outlawed by the civil authorities, and is stated to have died in prison by poison supplied by his relatives, to avoid the ignominy of a public execution.

It has been noticed by Mr. Malden as a remarkable peculiarity of the University of Bologna that females were admitted to its honors and offices. There is mention in early times of learned women who received degrees. Novella d'Andrea is said to have read lectures on jurisprudence, drawing, however, a curtain between herself and her auditors. Mrs. Piozzi speaks of La Dottoressa Laura Bassi, who taught mathematics and natural philosophy; and Lady Morgan, of Signora Clotilda Tambroni, a learned professor of Greek; while Madonna Manzolina even lectured on Anatomy. In the University of Padua there is a statue

of Ellena Lucretia Connaro, who obtained the degree of Doctor, or rather Doctress of Philosophy on June 25th, 1678. She is spoken of as a very celebrated young lady, who was highly esteemed for her amiability, angelic manners, and much admired for her learning, and who died with the reputation of sanctity.

As in ancient times Paris was the University most famous for the study of Theology, and Bologna for Law, so was Salerno for Medicine. The Constitutions of the Emperor Frederic II, for the regulation of medical practice in his paternal dominions, supply us with information as to the prescribed course of study in the thirteenth century in this University and that of Naples, which latter was founded by himself. Before entering on the study of medicine a three years' study of logic was required, though surgery might be learned at an earlier period. This, however, had to be studied at least a year, and a knowledge of the anatomy of human bodies had to be acquired in the schools. The medical course was to last five years, during which the Masters were to teach in the schools the authentic works of Hippocrates and Galen, both in theoretical and practical medicine. The student who had passed through this course, and desired to practice medicine, had then to be approved by the Masters in the full assembly of the University. After this examination, he received written testimonials, both of the Masters and others who had taken a degree, of his having studied the requisite time, and of his competent knowledge and general good character. With these, by which the academical degree was conferred, he was to appear before the King, or in his absence, of the Viceroy, and obtain a license to practice; and any one who presumed to attempt the healing art without having fulfilled these conditions was liable to the confiscation of his goods and a year's imprisonment. The same process was required for a license to practice surgery, except that the time of study appears to have been shorter; and when all this had been gone through, the new physician was required to practice for a year under the direction of an experienced brother. The Constitution of Frederic forbade any one to lecture on medicine or surgery except at Salerno or Naples, and prescribed that no one should take the title of Master without having been carefully examined by the Masters of Medicine and the officials of the Crown, who were probably some dignitaries entrusted with the superintendence of the Universities.

Salerno possessed a school of Law, but no mention is made of Philosophy or Theology. The University itself fell into decay from the neglect or discouragement of the Sovereigns, and long before the seventeenth century not a trace of it was left behind. The degrees of the University of Naples were never recognized in other Universities, probably for want of the Papal authority, its founder having been denounced as an enemy of the Church.

Having sketched in general the rise of European Universities, and described more particularly the ancient regulations of those in Italy, we are prepared to consider some recent remarkable changes introduced in that country. In the year 1862 an interesting and able debate took place in the Chamber of Deputies at Turin on the subject of the great national institutions of learning, and the means to be adopted for their improvement. All the speakers seemed to allow that the country was overstocked with these establishments, which was occasioned by the fact of its having until very recently comprised so many independent States, each of which naturally thought it desirable to be furnished with an University within its own borders. They were described as being generally in a very unsatisfactory condition. Studies had declined, the professors were not equal to their work, and a great lack of discipline was commonly prevalent. Complaint was made that neither by the students, nor their parents, did the Universities appear to be regarded as places of moral and intellectual training, where the minds of those who resorted to them were to be elevated by a course of liberal studies, and stored with valuable acquirements, but simply as institutions for conferring degrees; and so it was no uncommon thing for those who had studied, or proposed to study, in one University, towards the end of their course, to remove to another, where the examinations were easier and the graduating fees lighter than in their own. Shortly before this was stated, thirty students had gone from Pavia to Emilia on this very account. It will be readily perceived how impossible it must have been to maintain anything like academical discipline, where such a practice was allowed. Instances were also mentioned, in which, for the sake of saving money and time, it had been attempted by means of cramming, and entering the name on the class-list of professors whose lectures it would be impossible to attend, to get through a course of studies allotted to four or five years in two or three, to



the great injury of both the bodily and mental powers of those who made the attempt. It will be readily supposed that a degree sought with such feelings and by such means could not possess much intrinsic value; and, accordingly, one of the speakers declared that the diploma with which it was accompanied, instead of being a reliable attestation of the attainments of its possessor in the faculty wherein he had graduated, was in the case of at least a third of those who received it nothing better than a piece of paper which served to conceal their ignorance.

"I was present," said Signor Matteucci, the Minister of Public Instructions, "at a medical examination in the University of Naples"—the largest, by the way, in Italy, containing more than 9,000 students. "The examination was conducted with closed doors. The President of the Board of Examiners said to me: 'Is the Minister satisfied?' I put my head between my hands, and made a sign of being so, whereas, in reality, I could only blush. 'There are great difficulties,' it was observed by another speaker, the President of the Council, 'in the way of having strict examinations, and I repeat it for the hundredth time that none but distinguished and energetic professors, who have a high sense of their own dignity, and the courage to brave unpopularity with the students, make their examinations a serious work.'"

These difficulties consisted in the want of satisfactory schools preparatory to the Universities, in the inability to secure the attendance of the students at the Professors' lectures, and in the deficiency of well qualified Professors, which last was chiefly occasioned by the inadequacy of their remuneration. They would appear to have been appointed to their chairs by public competition, at an examination conducted *viva voce*. Many of these examinations, however, are described to have been of such a character as would have made even a young student blush. So great was the ignorance of many of the candidates, that it was found necessary to have a previous examination in private, and in writing, in order to prevent them from making a public exhibition of their incompetence.

There can be no question that institutions in such a condition were in urgent need of a thorough reform; but still it is satisfactory to find that they had among their sons men equal to the work. The debate from which we have extracted these details affords evidence of this. We believe that all who took part in it were University men, and some were or had been *officially* connected with

one or the other University. They differed, indeed, as was to be expected, in their opinions of the various measures proposed, but there was amongst all a breadth and intelligence of view, a lively perception of existing evils and deficiencies, a keen sensibility to the fallen condition of their country in respect of learning, and an earnest desire that she should once more stand forth in that literary and scientific glory with which she was adorned in former days. In fact, the speeches delivered on this occasion might well bear comparison with any that would be called forth under similar circumstances in any nation of Europe; and may we not attribute this, at least in part, to the University training received by the speakers?

During the last century and the early portion of this, the English Universities were, as places of education, most inefficient; and yet, even in their darkest days, the influence they exercised over the learning and culture of the nation was by no means inconsiderable. It seems, therefore, only just to mete with the same measure the Universities of Italy and those of England, and what we know of the latter, unhesitatingly to infer of the former.

It was mentioned in the course of this debate that in order to give effect to a previous law relating to the Universities, enacted by the Parliament, a regulation (*regolamento*) had to be drawn up, which work was entrusted to a commission. When, however, it was completed, instead of being forthwith communicated to the Faculties of the different Universities, it was forwarded by command of the Minister to an *Accademia* in order that it might contain no word or sentence inconsistent with the purest Italian; and this regard for the correctness of its phraseology actually occasioned the opening of the University sessions to be delayed for a month!

In consequence of this debate, a series of thirty-five questions was drawn up and transmitted to the Universities, which, from the answers returned by the various Faculties, appear to have been carefully considered. Our space would not allow us to give anything like an adequate idea of either the questions themselves, or the answers which they received; but one or two we will briefly touch upon by way of specimen.

The second question on the list is the following: "Ought the Faculty of Theology to be continued in all the Universities? or

will it be sufficient to establish this Faculty in one or two of the Universities of the Kingdom—or, perhaps, to found instead, in the future capital of the Kingdom a great theological, biblical, linguistic Institute, by agreement with the supreme authority of the Church?" This last suggestion met with general favor, though some few of the Faculties were opposed to it; but with regard to the continuance of the Faculty of Theology in the Universities, it was replied by the Faculty of Medicine and Surgery in the University of Naples, that "those doctrines were taught in the Universities which afforded opportunity for free discussion, and that it was not possible to teach any other theology than what formed a part of Philosophy." The Faculty of Natural Sciences in the same University was of opinion that "the State ought not to have an official University Theology;" and answers to the same effect were given by other Faculties of other Universities, whilst the Faculty of Medicine and Surgery at Pisa declared itself incompetent to give a reply. On the other hand, the Faculty of Philosophy and Philology at the same University considered that "the Faculty of Theology ought to be maintained, since the problems and scientific investigations of natural reason are enlarged and perfected by Revelation and the teachings of Authority; and therefore he who would take away the Theological Faculty from a complete course of University instruction, would deprive the other Faculties of their completeness, and, so to speak, of their consecration." The Medical and Surgical Faculty at Catania replied that, "in a Catholic kingdom, more than elsewhere, the Theological Faculty ought to be preserved in all the Universities, because theological subjects are not less interesting and useful to Christians than others, even as a means of advancing civilization (*civilta*); and since religion and civilization ought to be made common to the whole nation, it is necessary that theological instruction should be diffused as widely as possible." The Faculty of Physical and Mathematical Sciences was in favor of the existence of the Theological Faculty in all the Universities of the Kingdom, for two reasons: "1st. That an enlightened and liberal theology might be introduced in opposition to the narrow, retrograde and prejudiced theology of the present Seminaries. 2d. That the best materials might be provided for the establishment of a great Institute in the future capital of the Kingdom." On this subject I have preferred to give you first the

opinions of the secular Faculties. Those of Theology were naturally in favor of the continuance of their own department. Thus the one at Palermo says that the Faculty of Theology ought to be retained at least in the first-class Universities, since in such Universities born in non-Catholic kingdoms there are grand chairs of Theology, Morality, and Ecclesiastical History and Antiquities, to which even laymen resort, and, in England, ladies; and hence the children of error are, generally speaking, well informed on the subject of religion. And that at Pisa, "without discussing whether theological instruction should be continued in all, or in one or two Universities, would consider that it was wanting to itself, if it did not insist on the necessity of its basis, retained at the University of Pisa, to which it gave a beginning, and wherein it has flourished since its origin. Without theology the University would be destitute of that department of study, which enlightens and renders fruitful all the rest, whether philosophical, historical, literary or scientific. A society can hardly be imagined, informed and pervaded by the Christian element, if deprived of the theological element. Without its instruction, History especially becomes dumb." Of the Faculties who gave an opinion, twenty-four were in favor of the maintenance of theological instruction in all the Universities; four were for simply preserving it where it already existed; eight would have had it confined to the principal Universities; and eight thought that it should be allowed in none.

It was asked in the thirty-fourth question, the last one, "Is it thought desirable to oblige the students to wear, at academical hours, and in the University halls, a particular dress? and, if so, of what kind should it be?" In reply to this, part of the Faculty of Law at Bologna thought *not*, in any case; the other part, not, unless the dress were of a strictly academical character. The same Faculty at Naples was of opinion that it should not be required at present, but that if one were chosen, it should be that of the National Guard; whilst the Faculty of Theology at Palermo were altogether in favor of it. "At Oxford," they remark, "the students always wear their academical garb in the streets, but this would not be in accordance with Italian customs." On the other hand, the Medical Faculty of Naples simply replied that "the time for such distinctions is gone by;" the same Faculty at Pisa, "that it would be an useless annoyance to the young men,

and might prove a dangerous encouragement to the declining notions of caste and corporation, which were inconsistent with the present systems of civil equality, and apt to produce no trifling inconveniences through the restless and fickle disposition of youthful minds;" and the Faculty of Letters and Philosophy at Turin were of opinion that "it would be of no use except as a reproach to the student who did not observe propriety in his own dress, or who was guilty of smoking within the University precincts." The proposal was approved by four of the Faculties, and opposed by fifty-six.

We will not proceed farther with these questions. It will be sufficient to say that by the aid of the replies which they called forth, a body of statutes for all the Universities of the Kingdom—all, at least, in connection with the government—was drawn up by a committee appointed for the purpose, and submitted to the sovereign by the Minister of Public Instruction, Carlo Matteucci, with a very able and judicious statement of considerable length. We are sorry to state that this learned and enlightened philosopher died on the twenty-fourth of last June, at the age of 57, at Leghorn, whither he had gone for change of air and scene, and was buried in the Campo Santo at Pisa, of the University of which city he was a Professor. The statutes which he thus laid before the King received the royal sanction, and became University law. They established for all the Universities one and the same scale of fees, one and the same course of studies and examinations, thus doing away with the temptation to remove from one University to another, and indeed prohibiting a student who had failed in his examination at one to be received at another; whilst in cases of poverty, accompanied by diligence and ability, they allow the fees to be remitted. The Academical year commences on Nov. 1, and closes on Aug. 30, the months of November, July and August being set apart for examinations. The Universities are formally opened on Nov. 15. Lectures commence the day after, and are continued to the end of June. Examinations for admission and on special subjects, which appear to be annual, are held by a board of examiners, not all of whom belong to the University wherein they are carried on, who are each possessed of ten votes, and six-tenths of the whole number must be obtained by a student under examination to enable him to *pass*. If he obtain nine-tenths, he is said to be approved with full

legal votes ; and should he be so fortunate as to secure all, it is then put to the vote whether it shall be recorded in his certificate or diploma, that he has passed with praise. To enable him to do this, however, it must be carried unanimously. In the case of an examination for a doctor's degree, *seven-tenths* of the votes must be obtained ; and if a candidate obtain the whole number, it is further put to a division, and must, as before, be assented to by all, whether mention shall be made of the examination in the official gazette. A student so distinguished, receives a silver medal engraved with his name. The examination for this degree consists of a written essay on some subject drawn by lot, for the composition of which eight hours are allowed ; and two days afterwards, after the reading of the essay, of viva voce interrogations on points principally connected with the subject treated. This part of the examination must occupy at least an hour, exclusive of the reading of the essay.

Time would not allow us to state the course of studies prescribed for each of the Faculties ; but it may suffice to impart some idea of what is attempted in these Universities, if we give a brief detail of what is laid down for the Faculty of Philosophy and Letters. The course includes four years, and, to be admitted to it, it is necessary to produce a certificate from the lyceum (or grammar school), at which the applicant has been previously educated, and to pass an examination in the Italian and Latin languages and literature, in the Greek grammar, in ancient History and Geography, and in the elements of Philosophy. There are two degrees given in this Faculty—Doctor of Philosophy and Doctor of Letters. For the former the course prescribed is, in the first year, Latin Literature, Ancient History, Theoretic Philosophy, and Anthropology and Pedagogy ; in the second, Greek Literature, Theoretic Philosophy, History of Philosophy, and Modern History ; in the third, Greek Literature, Moral or Practical Philosophy, History of Philosophy, and Theoretic Philosophy ; and in the fourth, Moral or Practical Philosophy, History of Philosophy, Comparative Languages and Literature, and Philosophy of History. For the degree of Doctor of Letters, the first year is occupied with Greek, Latin, and Italian Literature, Ancient History and Ancient and Modern Geography ; the second, with the same, with the exception of Geography, and the addition of Modern History ; the third, with the same as the



second, except that Anthropology and Pedagogy were substituted for Ancient History; and the fourth with the three languages of the previous years, together with Archæology, Comparative Languages and Literature, and Philosophy of History. Students who have passed the special examination of the second year may receive the diploma of Bachelor of Philosophy of Letters, and on passing those of the third year, that of Licentiate; and a Doctor in either department may receive the same degree in the other by passing the requisite special examinations in the subjects not common to the two courses. The diploma of Bachelor or Licentiate qualifies its possessor to become a candidate for a chair, or, as we suppose we should call it, a mastership, in either a technical or a training school, or a gymnasium, all which are under the management of the government. The course required for a Doctor's degree in Law embraces five years; in Medicine and Surgery, six; in pure Mathematics, in Physical Mathematics, in Physical Chemistry, and in Natural History, all which are included in one Faculty, respectively, four, though a Doctor in one department may obtain the same degree in another at a much earlier period in consequence of the degree he already possesses.

"It is an old and uncontradicted truth," observes Mattecci, in that memorial addressed to the King which we have already mentioned, "that in the Universities we *learn to study*,—or, in other words, that University studies cannot at once make a learned man, nor a discoverer of new truths, but ought to impress on the mind, with methodical strictness, a certain number of general facts and principles, with which to proceed either to the exercise, or to the practical study, of a profession, so that with diligent application the student may arise hereafter to fame in science or in literature."

Words to the same effect had been used long before in our own country. In a note to "The Pursuits of Literature," a work that created a great sensation at the time of its appearance, of which the eighth edition, whence I am quoting, was printed in 1798, the author says:

"I would call the rising youth of this country to the intense, and fervent and unremitting study of the ancient classical writers as their primary choice. I call upon them to have the *courage* to be ignorant of many subjects and of many authors, at their inestimable age. I exhort them affectionately, as a matter of the most serious importance, never to pretend to study in their first academical years what they design as the ultimate end of their labors—I mean their profession. Their whole business is to lay the foundation of knowledge, original, sound, and strong. In particular, the study of

the Law, *as such*, should never be entered upon, even *in limine*, before the first degree in Arts is obtained. The specific study of it in the Universities, at that early age, confines and cripples the faculties. Such a student may arrive at mere knowledge as a special pleader; but he will never be illustrious, or ornamental to his profession. I wish to observe with particular emphasis, that when a man has once entered upon any profession whatsoever, his education has in fact ceased. They who by a patient continuance and undivided attention to academical studies *alone*, have sought for the original materials of science and of solid fame, have seldom failed in their great pursuit."

Such an agreement, at periods so distant, and in countries so different, between an eminent scholar and a distinguished natural philosopher (for such was Matteucci, engaged especially in the study of electricity and other kindred subjects), is, in my opinion, very remarkable, and deserves the attentive consideration of all who are interested in the welfare and success of University education. Within the last few years great additions have been made to the branches of study pursued within them, principally of a scientific character, and intended to have reference to the future occupations of the students. But is it not to be feared that this variety of pursuits, besides rendering the knowledge acquired wanting in depth and solidity, and so incapable of forming a fitting foundation for further attainments, should, by distracting the attention, weaken the powers of the mind, and so render them unequal to the pursuit of any study requiring deep thought and patient consideration? Such is stated by the writer I have already quoted (Matteucci) to have been the effect in the University of Italy.

From the general impulse given to early education, "the students of our times," he says, "are younger than those of a former period; the number of those who cultivate the sciences is greater; industry re-acts in its turn for the perfection of scientific theories; facts are multiplied and accumulated; but all this intellectual activity prevalent with regard to the physical sciences and their application, which is the most remarkable manifestation of our times, implies no increase in the power of the intellect. From the increase of the number of Professorships which has taken place in every Faculty, it might be supposed that the intellectual powers of the student had increased in the same proportion; but this is not, and cannot be. And in the average of the young men, the consequences of this discordance are shown in a want of depth in the theoretical and substantial studies, in a certain degree of confusion in their various and imperfect acquirements, and in the insufficiency and unsatisfactoriness of the examinations. It is of no use to conceal it.

All those who have experience of University teaching, and who live among the students, are continually meeting with young men, if we except those of uncommon abilities, who have reached the end of their academical course, possessed indeed of many cursory attainments, but unable to draw strict conclusions, and deficient in the fundamental principles of the theory of the science to which they are devoted."

In addition to what is here stated, may it not be worthy of consideration, whether these sciences themselves, which have of late years met with so extraordinary a degree of favor, concerned as they are exclusively with the external world, and having for their main object the increase of wealth and temporal power, personal comfort and social convenience, have the same tendency or ability in themselves to "improve the intellectual and moral being, to correct the taste, to strengthen the judgment, and to instruct us in the wisdom of men better and wiser than ourselves," as those studies of scholarship and literature, which they have in a great measure superseded?

Universities have hitherto come before us simply as places of instruction for those who are approaching, or have just entered into, manhood; and we believe that this is the light in which they are in general exclusively regarded by even many of the better informed. How pleasing to find that no one of the speakers in the debate on which we dwelt somewhat at length in the early part of this address, presented them in a different light!

"I have," it was said, "a larger idea of the Universities than that which is generally entertained. The Universities are more than schools, more than institutes wherein are taught the subjects necessary for acquiring a profession; they ought to be truly *academies*, in which science is produced, is created. In other words, they ought to be places of retirement, wherein learned men may pursue their studies so as to become qualified, whenever occasion shall arise, to instruct their countrymen or the world on those subjects to which they have devoted themselves, and thus add to the permanent literature of their nation. In conformity with this principle, the Italian Government grants every year four exhibitions at each of the Universities of Bologna, Naples, Pavia, Palermo, Pisa, and Turin, to men who have taken a Doctor's degree within the last four years, in any University of the kingdom, in the Faculties of Law, Medicine, Physical Mathematics, and Philosophy and Letters, and have given subsequent proof of their ability and attainments by either examination or authorship, to enable them to pursue their studies for an additional period, in any place chosen by themselves, which is considered to afford special advantages for so doing. The amount of the exhibition, from one to two thousand francs, is determined by a ministerial decree, as well as

the number of years for which it is granted, and the place where the exhibitor is to reside; and he is required to transmit every three months to the Office of Public Instruction certificates of his diligence and progress in the branch of study to which he is devoted. The neglect of this regulation is visited with admonition, suspension, and, finally, deprivation of the exhibition."

It was the same desire to promote the attainment of excellence in the pursuits of literature and science, and the same conviction that it was to be accomplished only by serious and laborious study, that led to the establishment of these exhibitions, which gave rise, in past ages, in the English Universities, to those many noble foundations, which have "afforded to the learned and studious a shelter from the bustle and distraction of the world, where they might pursue at leisure the studies which elevate their own minds, and benefit the world at large." And it is impossible to say how much England is indebted to them for what they thus effected, especially in those times when they were most taken advantage of for this purpose. Thus to give but one or two instances. Hooker, who died at the age of 46, in 1600, had resided fifteen years at Corpus Christi College, Oxford, which he left in 1582. Archbishop Laud was nearly fifty when he quitted St. John's, in the same University, in 1626, where he had lived more than thirty years. Joseph Mede died in his rooms at Christ's College, Cambridge, in 1638, at the age of fifty-two, having lived in College two-thirds of his time. And Henry Moore died in 1675, aged sixty-one, in the same College, where he had resided forty-four years. It may, perhaps, excite surprise that we should mention Archbishop Laud, whom Lord Macaulay has characterized as "a poor creature who never did, said, or wrote any thing indicating more than the ordinary capacity of an old woman." Now it will be at once understood that we are not here concerned with the Archbishop's principles, political, ecclesiastical, or religious. We have simply in view his abilities and attainments as a scholar; and regarding him in this light, we feel that it is impossible to doubt that Lord Macaulay had never read a single page of the writings of the man whom he scruples not to speak of in these terms. He was evidently led to the use of such language by his political sentiments; but Dr. Parr, whom even he would have allowed to be no incompetent judge, and who would have sympathized with him to a great extent in both politics and religion, had formed a very different judgment. "Let

me not forget," says he, writing to Charles Butler, "the *Answer of Archbishop Laud to Fisher*: Laud investigates, Laud reasons, Laud distinguishes, Laud reviles not, and surely you and I must sympathize in holy indignation when we read that, during the infamous trial of Laud, his candor to an adversary was one topic of accusation against him." We may add that this work, his *Conference with Fisher*, the materials for which he had doubtless amassed during his residence at Oxford, is such a monument of learning, reasoning, eloquence, and moderation, as ought to ensure the highest appreciation of his literary character, even from those who, in other respects, are the most opposed to him.

Now it is much to be wished that all Universities might become the homes of a race of students like him, and those others named, to whom we might add many more. Literature was never so widely diffused and popular as it is now, but has not this come to pass through a lowering of its character? "Philosophy," it has been well said, "cannot raise the commonalty up to her level; if she is to become popular, she must sink to theirs." Surely it is to be desired that amid the bustle, and excitement, and distraction, and superficiality of the present day, men should arise who will cultivate Literature and Philosophy for their own sake, and who by hard study and patient thought will exceed the literary glory of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and thus encourage others who are competent to tread in their steps, whilst even among men of inferior powers they exercise an elevating and sobering influence!

And how important for the American Church to turn to her advantage the experience of Europe in completing her educational work! She may well study the reports of the Italian Commission as given in this Article. They really embody the wisdom of ages. The Church in this country needs a vast University which shall be the crown and glory of a system beginning with the Parish School, and rising by proper gradations to a National Institution established on a plan so solid and so liberal that it will command the admiration of our republic and of the world.

## ART. IX.—ENGLISH REFORMERS AND ENGLISH PURITANS CONTRASTED.

THE struggles of the English Church, on the one hand with Romanism, and on the other hand with Puritanism, exhibit some striking analogies and some striking contrasts.

The conflict with Rome assumed its serious and aggressive form in the reign of Henry the Eighth; continued with almost uniform success under Edward the Sixth, as if about to end in a decisive triumph, when Queen Mary coming to the throne rescued Romanism from its defeat, restored it again to power, and seemingly determined the final issue of the contest against the Church of England. Then Elizabeth ascending the throne, Protestantism was saved from its discomfiture, and an advantage gained for the Church which secured victory in the completed Reformation. But hardly was this struggle ended when another began with the Puritans.

Parties which had been friends and allies in the opposition to Rome, when their purpose was accomplished, made such demands as endangered the truth now secured, and threatened the disintegration of the Church itself, and in these demands increased their zeal till a new and serious contest was inaugurated.

This new opponent began its open work in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, increased its activity and power in that of James the First, and seemed to gain the final victory under Charles the First in obtaining control of the Church and civil power. But as once before the Church was raised from the grave of defeat, so now again its life and rule were restored under Charles the Second, and its foe subjected for all time to come. The failure of the Puritans to gain their desires at the Conference of Savoy and the next Convocation, was followed by a succession of discomfitures in every attempt afterward. In the beginning of each of these struggles the Church was successful. Under King Henry the Eighth, with all the reaction and apparent retrogression of the Protestant cause, the Papal Supremacy over England had been effectually opposed and destroyed. Under Queen Elizabeth the Puritans were successfully resisted. Under Edward the Sixth the



Church seemed to complete her victory over Rome. Under James the First the demands of the Puritans were officially regarded, refuted, and refused. Under Queen Mary the power of Rome had been suddenly exalted over the Reformers; their work stayed, and seemingly undone. Under Charles the First, the Puritans, taking advantage of Civil and Ecclesiastical oppression, gained control of the Church and State, and seemed to attain security in their triumph. The reaction from Queen Mary's cruelty with the Reformers resulted in the completion of the Reformation. The reaction from the excesses and instability of Cromwell's rule saved the Church from any serious change which the Puritans sought.

Thus the English nation, before giving her final verdict on the questions of the Reformation, had the knowledge of its operations under Edward the Sixth, and the repeated experience of Roman power under Queen Mary, as, if having a trial of both, she might wisely make her final choice. That choice was for Protestantism. So in respect to Puritanism. Under Elizabeth and James the First the nation learned the workings of Protestantism as the Reformers shaped it, with its liturgy and episcopal government; and under Cromwell perceived the operations of Puritanism; that having tasted of both these systems it might wisely form a final judgment. It elected the Church of the reformation in preference to the Church of the revolution.

Such are some analogies in the struggles. Points of contrast also gain our attention.

The first conflict was with the Papacy, for self-purification—to cast off superstitions, errors and corruptions. The second, with the Puritans, was for self-preservation.

We do not mean that the Puritans sought to subvert the Protestant doctrines which the Reformers had established; but whatever their designs, the Church believed that their efforts tended indirectly to endanger that doctrine, and directly to the subversion of her present order and organization.

Further observe in the strife with Rome, the Church had but a single enemy, and could put forth her efforts without complication. But in her strife with the Puritans, her old foe, Rome, was watching, though subjected, to renew her power.

And such was the hostility of these two enemies to each other,

that it required keen discernment and careful judgment so to injure one as not to seem to be helping the other. It was like fighting one army with a second in the rear.

Another point of contrast is the *subject matter* at issue in the two struggles.

With Rome the contest respected the vital points of the Christian doctrine; the all important difference between truth and falsehood, faith and superstition; the bondage of the soul and its liberty in Christ Jesus. In the contest with the Puritans we see the subjects at issue were chiefly *forms* and *ceremonies*. The Reformers sought to purify the life of the Church; the Puritans to change her costume. It is hardly possible to exaggerate this contrast—the intrinsic and serious importance of the work done by the Reformers and the comparative trifles for which the Puritans labored.

Let the history of the two parties present this antagonism in its true colors.

We begin the history by placing side by side two characteristic papers, which from the place they fill in the disputations of the parties, may be considered as symbols of their respective and essential principles.

The first representative, in part, of the work of the Reformers, is the noted challenge of Bishop Jewell. In the reign of Queen Elizabeth he stands as a typical man in the restoration of the Church from the papal doctrines reinstated by Queen Mary. He is the chief disputant of the Protestant party, "the boldest and most uncompromising foe of Rome." In a sermon preached before the Court, at Paul's Cross, on 17th of March, 1559–60, he fearlessly challenges his enemy to a contest on the important questions at issue between them.

We select the points in this challenge as a careful *resume* of Protestant principles at stake in his time, and by adding to them a statement of principles previously established, we make a complete exhibition of the Reformers' work. The paper which we contrast with this is the important document presented by the Puritans in the Conference of Savoy, containing their "exceptions to the Book of Common Prayer." Considering how long the Puritans had been agitating their claims, even since the reign of Elizabeth, and that they were now requested to make a statement of the same to be officially noticed and acted upon by the ecclesiasti-

cal authorities, we may conclude that they will make as strong a case as possible. Adding to this paper the increased demands afterward made by the Puritans, we shall have a fair presentation of their work and aims.

#### BISHOP JEWELL'S CHALLENGE.

If any learned man of all our adversaries, or if all the learned men that be alive, be able to bring any one sufficient sentence out of any old Catholic doctor or father, or out of any old general council, or out of the Holy Scripture of God, or any one example of the primitive Church, whereby it may be clearly and plainly proved (1) that there was any private mass in the whole world at that time for the space of six hundred years after Christ.

(2) Or that there was any Communion ministered unto the people under one kind.

(3) Or that the people had their common prayers then in a strange tongue that they understood not.

(4) Or that the Bishop of Rome was then called an universal bishop, or the head of the universal Church.

(5) Or that the people was then taught to believe that Christ's body is really, substantially, corporally, carnally, or naturally in the Sacrament.

(6) Or that his body is, or may be, in a thousand places or more at one time.

(7) Or that the priest did then hold up the Sacrament over his head.

(8) Or that the people did then fall down and worship it with godly honor.

(9) Or that the Sacrament was then, or now ought to be, hanged up under a canopy.

#### PROPOSALS OF THE PURITANS.

And therefore in pursuance of this his Majesty's most gracious Commission, for the satisfaction of tender consciences and the procuring of peace and unity among ourselves, we judge meet to propose.

(1) That all the prayers and other materials of the Liturgy may consist of nothing doubtful or questioned amongst pious, learned, or orthodox persons.

(2) That the Liturgy be so composed, as to gain upon the judgment and affection of all those who in the substantial of the protestant religion are of the same persuasions with ourselves.

(3) That the repetitions and responsals of the clerk and people and the alternate reading of the psalms and hymns be omitted.

(4) That the particulars of the Litany may be composed into one solemn prayer, to be offered by the minister for the people.

(5) That there be nothing in the Liturgy which may seem to countenance the observation of Lent as a religious fast.

(6) That the religious observation of saints-days, appointed to be kept as holy-days, may be omitted.

(7) That there be no such imposition of the Liturgy as that the exercise of the gift of prayer be totally excluded in any part of public worship.

(8) That it may be left to the dis-

(10) Or that in the Sacrament, after the words of consecration, there remaineth only the accidents and shews, without the substance, of bread and wine.

(11) Or that the priest then divided the Sacrament in three parts, and afterwards received himself all alone.

(12) Or that whosoever had said the Sacrament is a figure, a pledge, a token, or a remembrance of Christ's body, had therefore been judged for an heretic.

(13) Or that it was lawful then to have thirty, twenty, fifteen, ten or five masses said in one church, in one day.

(14) Or that images were then set up in the churches to the intent that the people might worship them.

(15) Or that the lay people was then forbidden to read the Word of God in their own tongue.

(16) Or that it was then lawful for the priest to pronounce the words of consecration closely and in silence to himself.

(17) Or that the priest had then authority to offer up Christ unto His Father.

(18) Or to communicate and receive the Sacrament for another as they do.

(19) Or to apply the virtue of Christ's death and passion to any man by the means of the mass.

(20) Or that it was then thought a sound doctrine to teach the people that the mass, *ex opere operato*, that is, even for that it is said and done, is able to remove any part of our sin.

(21) Or that any Christian man called the Sacrament his Lord and God.

(22) Or that the people was then

cretion of the minister, to omit part of the Liturgy, as occasion may require.

(9) That the new translation of the Scriptures be allowed by authority alone to be used.

(10) That nothing be read in the church for lessons but the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments.

(11) That the minister be not required to rehearse any part of the Liturgy at the Communion-table, save only those parts which properly belong to the Lord's Supper, and that at such times only when the said Holy Supper is administered.

(12) That the word "minister" and not priest or curate be used throughout the whole book.

(13) That instead of the word "Sunday" the word "Lord's-day" may be everywhere used.

(14) That we may have an amended or purer version of psalms.

(15) That all obsolete words in the Common Prayer, and such whose use is changed from their first signification, be altered.

(16) That no portions of the Old Testament or of the Acts of the Apostles be called "Epistles" and read as such.

(17) That the phrase in the several offices, such as presumes all persons within the communion of the church to be regenerated, converted and in an actual state of grace be reformed.

(18) That instead of the various short collects there may be one methodical and entire form of prayer composed out of many of them.

(19) That the present Liturgy seems very defective, in that there is no preparatory prayer in our address to God for assistance and acceptance;

taught to believe, that the body of Christ remaineth in the Sacrament as long as the accidents of the bread remain there without corruption.

(23) Or that a mouse or any other worm or beast may eat the body of Christ (for so some of our adversaries have said and taught).

(24) Or that when Christ said, *Hoc est Corpus meum*, this word *hoc* pointeth not to the bread but *individuum vagum*, as some of them say.

(25) Or that these accidents, or forms, or shews of bread and wine, be the sacraments of Christ's body and blood, and not rather the very bread and wine itself.

(26) Or that the Sacrament is a sign or token of the body of Christ that lieth hidden underneath it.

(27) Or that ignorance is the mother and cause of true devotion and obedience—if any one of all our adversaries be able to avouch any one of all these articles, by any such sufficient authority of Scriptures, doctors or councils, as I have required—as I said before, so say I now again, I am content to yield unto him, and to subscribe.

(20) And in that the Confession does not clearly express original sin, nor sufficiently enumerate actual sins with their aggravations;

(21) And in such forms of publick praise and thanksgiving as are suitable to gospel worship.

(22) Also that the Catechism is defective as to many necessary doctrines of our religion, nor is the Creed as explicit as it ought to be in a Catechism.

(23) That the ministry be not required to wear a surplice in celebrating publick worship.

(24) That the transient image of the cross be not required in baptism.

(25) That the practice of kneeling in the act of receiving the Lord's Supper, be not imposed.

These things themselves, that are desired to be removed, not being of the foundation of religion, nor the essentials of public worship, nor the removal of them any way tending to the prejudice of the church or state; therefore their continuance and rigorous imposition can no ways be able to countervail the laying aside of so many pious and able ministers, and the inconceivable grief that will arise to multitudes of his Majesty's most loyal and peaceable subjects, who upon all occasions are ready to serve him with their prayers, estates and lives.

We invite attention to the contrast which these papers make in regard to the weight or seriousness of the subjects which they respectively present for controversy; and to the candid *confession* of the Puritans of *that day*, that the things which they agitated were not "of the foundation of religion nor the essentials of public worship," over against the *fact* that the things which the Reformers agitated, *were every one of them*, among "the foundations of religion and the essentials of public worship."

Respecting the Holy Scriptures; the Reformers found these in an unknown tongue and witholden from the people. They translated them into the common language, and caused them to be read in the common service of the Church, and to be multiplied for private use.

The Puritans proposed respecting the Holy Scriptures—behold the contrast—that one translation be used rather than another.

The Reformers found the Lord's Supper changed into an object of idolatry, and the Cup kept from the laity. They restored the simple breaking of Bread and distribution of the Cup. The alteration respecting the Lord's Supper which the Puritans proposed, and which they agitated for a generation, pertained to the posture of the individual in receiving it. They simply desired *not to kneel*.

Respecting Prayer, the Reformers found this service in an unknown tongue, and embracing manifold superstitions. They eliminated the supplications to the Saints and the Virgin, and changed the language to that of the people, so that instead of listening to innumerable words in a dark speech, believers heard their very spiritual desires in the words of common life. The Puritans' demand respecting Prayer, was that the Collect and the Litany be made into some continuous form of addresses to God, unbroken by responses or separation of distinct petitions. This is all. They found no superstition or indistinct language to be removed—but simply *wanted the words put in a different order*.

We propose not to follow this contrast, in detail, but simply in this brief beginning to discover its proportions, and suggest to those not familiar with it the reward of a full study. For it is the same throughout. Superstitious ignorance, idolatry, bondage, extortion, tyranny, were removed by the Reformers, while the Puritans would change some words—their form, or order—omit some sign or ceremony—and alter something external. The chief burdens of Popery named in Bishop Jewell's Challenge, were Papal tyranny, ignorance of Scripture, and false doctrine. The chief burdens which troubled the Puritans were, the use of the surplice, the practice of kneeling to receive the bread and wine, and the sign of the cross in baptism.

We are aware that these papers do not contain the full principles of the Reformers, and the Puritans. Bishop Jewell professes



not to be giving an entire synopsis of the doctrines and practices which distinguish the Church of England from Rome—but only those which were then more especially in dispute.

And the schedule of the Puritans which we present was doubtless shaped more by what they thought it probable they could obtain, than by what they would like. Certain it is that Puritanism came to differ from the Church in more points than those suggested. Still, when the work of the Reformation is compared with the work of the Puritans, we think the two will stand in contrast nearly as the two papers which have been noticed. In stating more completely the changes which the Reformers wrought in the Church, we begin with the first, and in some respects, most important change of all—the abolition of the Pope's Supremacy. There existed first the belief in this supremacy; and then the fact of its existence—the very rule of the Pope which seemed a firmly established tyranny over the Church. We shall be able to appreciate the intolerable burden only by attending to some of its workings, or its practical relations as seen in the following specifications of its constituent parts.

- I. "A judicial power in matters ecclesiastical or cases of appeal."
- II. "A power of granting licenses and dispensations."
- III. "A liberty to send legates into England, and to hold legatine Courts."
- IV. "A power of granting investiture of Bishops, of Confirming Episcopal elections and of distributing ecclesiastical patronage."
- V. "A privilege of receiving first fruits, the tenths of English benefices, and the goods of the clergy who die intestate."

A careful study of the power here implied will reveal that it amounted to a complete despotism over men's souls, bodies and estates,—a perfect inquisition over their faith and conduct. Here was the very bond of all the superstition and corruption which had accumulated in the Roman Church. There seemed no hope for reform with this despotism in force. And we have evidence that the Roman Church lays her chief stress on this article in her creed. She will endure much laxity in other parts if the Pope's Supremacy is acknowledged. In the days of Queen Elizabeth when the Roman Clergy desired to be re-united to the Roman Church, the chief and almost only demand of the Pope was the acknowledgment of his Supremacy.

We dwell thus on this first change accomplished by the Reformation, to show what was the head and front of papal offence; the

bond and security of all other corruptions and superstitions which needed to be removed. This bond must be severed, or the Reformation could not proceed.

The ecclesiastical authorities of the realm discarded the doctrine, and with this preparation and support, the King, Henry the Eighth, cast off the papal power.

The next movement in importance was the Translation of the Holy Scripture in the tongue of the common people, and the reading of the same in the service of the Church.

And then, the Church being delivered from the tyranny of Rome and illuminated with the word of truth, the following changes were accomplished.

The Adoration of relics and the worship of Saints, Angels and the Virgin was abolished.

The Clergy were permitted to marry, and the power of the Monasteries was destroyed.

The doctrine and evil practices of Indulgences, Auricular Confession and Purgatory were disproved and rejected.

In place of the mass, the sacrament of the Lord's Supper was restored; private masses were abolished; transubstantiation was denied; the Adoration of the Host was discarded and the Cup was given to the people.

And when these superstitions and errors were eliminated from the Church, the book of Common Prayer was prepared containing a specific denial of these manifold errors, with the prayers and offices of the Church in the language of the people.

One cannot review this catalogue of the changes wrought by the Reformers without being impressed with the serious nature of every one, and how related to the very substance and life of true religion. Nothing seems trifling, nothing small, nothing unworthy the vital struggle and great risks which the prosecution of the work produced. The errors refuted are made so clear that there is no room for suspecting self-opinion in those agitating their removal. The evil practices were so gross that no one thinks of wilfulness or insubmission in those who opposed them. Turning now to the work which the Puritans accomplished or designed, we may express this in a few words.

It was the destruction of the Liturgy and the overthrow of Bishops.

In the above paper we see the changes which they asked to be made in the Liturgy in order to adapt it to their consciences, or ideas of propriety. Underneath these proposals, and in substance contained in them, was the entire abolition of liturgical worship. The request to leave it to the discretion of each Clergyman to omit or use any part of the liturgy was in substance an aim at its very existence.

There was a prejudice which in some minds involved a conscientious objection against those prayers and formularies which had been in use during all the corruptions of the mediæval ages, although they were pure and rich in devotional feeling and expression. And also there was a growing idea of some special influence of the Holy Spirit in extemporaneous worship for which the Liturgy, they thought, furnished no opportunity.

Not all the Puritans, indeed, perhaps not most of them, felt this thorough hostility to the Liturgy, but some made bold expression of it; and it would surely have resulted from the sentiments of others who were more moderate.

And further, although most of the Puritans in the day when the above paper was prepared, believed in some form of Episcopacy, and were not conscious of desires to revolutionize or even destroy the very organization of the Church by removing all Bishops from power and giving place to Presbyterianism or Independency, it proved in the end that this radical issue was virtually contained in the movement they were making. This result was an inference from Puritan principles if not consciously aimed at. To the Brownists, and others who would not willingly acknowledge the name, the hierarchy of the English Church was as offensive as Popery itself. Many, who, in the circumstances, advocated the Episcopal form of government, believed it would and should in due time give way to the order now established in Geneva. It was an essential part of the Puritan spirit to import the extreme doctrines and forms of Geneva and Zurich.

We believe then that two brief mottoes were inscribed from the beginning on the banners of the Puritans—AWAY WITH THE LITURGY; AND DOWN WITH THE BISHOPS.

These sentiments are nearly an accurate statement of what they would do, and of what they did accomplish for themselves,

when in Old England the Act of Toleration was passed, and when in New England they were left to their liberty.

Thus we reduce the changes which the Puritans sought simply to an alteration in the mode of worship and the kind of church government. It was a question about forms in which they struggled, and for which they disturbed the peace of England.

In drawing this limit to the work of the Puritans we are not ignorant of some most serious results which were indirectly connected with it. Being the weaker party in the contest they became the subjects of oppression from ecclesiastical and civil powers, and the tyranny which their insubordination provoked assumed such proportions as at length caused the nation to rise and proclaim some new principles of liberty and constitutional government. And there are not wanting partial or superficial historians who give to the Puritans the full credit of that progress in civil and religious liberty which has been made since the beginning of their movement.

We have then in making out what was distinctively Puritan to draw a line between what was definitely intended, and what was simply contemporaneous or indirectly connected.

The little honor resulting from making a great strife about small matters has naturally been a motive for such explanations or exhibitions of the Puritan aims and work as would magnify their importance.

In order therefore to confirm our statement of what was distinctively Puritan, we need to notice some unfounded assumptions or pretensions.

The Puritans were not distinguished from other professedly good men in *exalting the individual conscience* as the guide of conduct. Good Churchmen are as tenacious as devout Puritans in doing what their consciences dictate.

But there is this difference between the two. The Churchman considers the Church and his spiritual officers as God's appointed guides of conscience, while the Puritan seeks his guide in experiences and peculiar emotions as he himself may interpret them.

But the conscience instructed by authorized teachers is just as truly an *individual* conscience as the one which looks chiefly to

some special emotions. The difference is not that one more than the other exalts conscience, but lies in the way of disciplining conscience. One other peculiarity respecting conscience may be said to mark the Puritans—not all indeed, but many—which is, an excessive scrupulosity, or what the apostle would call weakness. The making so much of a garment, or posture, or sign, tends to exalt unessential things as if they were of chief importance. There is a frailty of conscience of this kind which doubtless is found oftener among Puritans than among Churchmen. Nor were the Puritans singular in exalting the Holy Scriptures as the highest authority in the revelation of God's will. Because the Churchman makes distinctive use of the doings and sayings of the early Fathers in the Church as helps in understanding the Scriptures, as they were nearest the time of the events and customs in question, therefore it is charged upon him that he puts the Fathers in place of Scripture. But the history of the Reformation shows beyond doubt that the Reformers were guided in their work at all times by the Divine Oracles. Indeed we need only to quote the Article of the Church in this matter to prove that no person could exalt the Word of God above the place it holds in the Church for reverence and full confidence.

*Article VI.* "Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation, so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of the faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation."

No words could more emphatically deny that the Church ever substitutes any human words of fathers or councils for the Holy Scriptures.

Nor was it a peculiarity of the Puritans that they sought to bring the soul directly to God, while the Church placed between the ministry and sacraments. Here again is the confusion made by not distinguishing a necessary means from the end sought. The Church does indeed hold that, ordinarily, her ministry and her sacraments are God's appointed instrumentality for leading men to His presence, but would call it idolatry to substitute these for Himself. And, too, the Church looks with unbelief on that system which proposes to bring the soul into union with God without the aid of any objective instrumentality, leaving it to its own gropings and hungerings, because she has observed that those thus

left to so called self-guidance usually err in seeking God in some emotions which they cannot command, and so they often slumber in darkness long seasons when, with proper help, they might have been rejoicing in peace, and hope, and truth.

Nor was it a peculiarity of the Puritan that he sought to make *spiritual* the worship of God. The very office which he would destroy was devised with the single intent of aiding the spiritual worship of believers. No communion more than this liturgical Church exalts the teaching of Jesus, that "they who worship God must worship in spirit and in truth."

And it is mere presumption to hold as an axiom, that the spiritual part in worship is in inverse proportion to the form employed, else is Quakerism the true mode of worship.

Nor were the Puritans alone in that they sought to *restore the primitive order* in church worship and government. No one purpose was oftener professed by the Reformers than the re-establishment of the Apostolic Order; and no one claim is now oftener made by the Church which they reformed, than that they succeeded in the restoration of Apostolic Catholicity. The difference here is simply one of judgment as to what was the primitive pattern.

Archbishop Cranmer, in his memorable appeal in 1556, after the sentence of degradation had been passed upon him, and he was standing on the brink of death, said :

"Touching my doctrine, of whatsoever kind it be, I protest that it was ever my mind purely and simply to imitate and teach those things only which I had learned from the Holy Scriptures, and of the holy catholic Church of Christ *from the beginning.*"

Whether or not the English Church be patterned after the Apostolic Order, no communion more than she has been animated with single purpose to find and to imitate it.

Nor did the Puritans embrace in their plans the *severance of Church and State*. They had not attained to this modern idea of the division of ecclesiastical matters from the civil power, and cannot justly be credited with agitating this reform.

In testimony of this statement we quote the following :

\* "As for Calvin and the disciplinarians, or puritans, as they are called, they subscribe all the confessions for magistracy and take the same oaths of allegiance and supremacy as others do, and they plead and write for them, so that for my part I know not of any difference in doctrine."

\* Baxter's Works, vol. i. p. 764.



\* "But Calvin neither liked a pope-king nor a king-pope. Nor do we approve of that in the king which we detest in the pope. But he with us and we with him do judge that King James hath as much to do in the Christian Church as Josias had in the Jewish Church, and we go not about to get any more."

See further the principles of the Puritans in the compact on the Mayflower, where, in all the freedom which they gained by their exile, they recognise their spiritual privileges and liberties, not as theirs by *personal right*, but "by the grace of the king."

Also we may refer to the very practice of the Puritans in New England for generations, in enforcing religious and church duties by the power of the magistrate.

Nor were the Puritans actuated in their work with the desire to establish *Religious Toleration*. They had not attained to this idea of modern society, and are falsely credited with being martyrs to this principle. In testimony to the truth of this declaration we may look to all their conferences, disputations and proposals with the Church of England and find not one single demand for any such liberty. They even opposed it when it was not proposed by others. In the Parliament where the power was with them they refused to give toleration lest thereby Popery might again gain power in the realm. In the Conference at Savoy, a proposal was made for toleration of all kinds of religious faith, and Baxter definitely opposed it. We find no statement of this principle in the formation of the first Church by the Separatists, nor in the compact on the Mayflower, nor in the early faith or practice of the New England exiles.

The toleration for which the Puritans sought was simply toleration for themselves, so long as the power of Church and State was against them. But while they believed that the civil power should not molest themselves they ever sanctioned its opposition to Popery—and when under the reign of Cromwell they gained the control of Church and State, they were no more tolerant of the faith and practice of Churchmen than had the Church, in the past, been of themselves. They enacted a law of conformity which forbade the

---

\* Bishop Andrews.

use of the Book of Common Prayer, and enforced the Directory with such rigor as resulted in the ejection from their livings of thousands of the Clergy of the English Church.

We refer to this not to blame them—for they were only dealing with others as they had been themselves treated, and according to the principles of government then in vogue. They are not to be censured for the twilight of freedom which then prevailed—nor are they to be credited with believing, and seeking to establish a principle which so uniformly they opposed.

And now we are ready to repeat our definition of the work of the Puritans. We find its length and breadth in the two mottoes—AWAY WITH THE LITURGY, and DOWN WITH THE BISHOPS. Whatever worth might be in this change, they were seeking it, and no more—whatever reform might result from these theories they would accomplish, and no more.

To help memory, and to enforce the contrast, we will tabulate the distinctive part in the works and aims of the two parties which we notice.

The Reformers succeeded in abolishing from the Church the following errors and evil practices;

The Papal Supremacy; the Withholding the Holy Scriptures from the people; Celibacy of the Clergy; Transubstantiation; the Mass; the Adoration of the Host; Withholding the Cup from the Laity; Indulgences; Auricular Confession; Adoration of Relics and Images; the Five Additional Sacraments; Purgatory; Supplication of Saints; the Infallibility of Popes and particular Churches.

We see from this historical review, that the work of reforming the Church of England from the errors of Rome was accomplished according to Church-principles. We mean by Church-principles what the language now signifies in contradistinction from Puritan principles. These terms indicate two different methods of religious working. In comparing the two, it is no small testimony in favor of the Church-method to say that it was the one employed, and with success, in recovering from the darkness and evils of Roman power. To say the least, such testimony proves this system to have some worth, and it becomes competing theories and practices in religious affairs to be somewhat modest concerning their superiority, until they have proved by their works, equal efficiency.

But the more special bearing of this statement is in distinguishing two movements in the religious history of England—that of the Reformers and that of the Puritans. Here is the dividing line. The Puritan movement was something subsequent and entirely distinct from the Reformation. The Puritan in his character and operation did not work with the Reformers, nor did he follow them in the same course. He attempted a different mission.

The errors of Rome, which we have specifically noticed, were attacked in the legal, sober method of condemnation and rejection by the acts of Convocation and Parliament. And as much as we now value the separation of the Church from the State, it is quite apparent that the centralized and despotic power of Rome could not have been successfully opposed except by the civil arm. Some are apt to think chiefly of the disadvantages which result from the union of Church and State, because of the oppression it worked upon true Protestants, forgetting that the laws of conformity which bore hard on these, were absolutely necessary in the removal of Popery. The influence for the Protestant cause from the two Formularies of Doctrine, "The necessary Doctrine and Erudition" and "The Institution of a Christian Man," set forth by the convocation and enforced by the civil power, together with the Book of Common Prayer, will probably never be appreciated in this day of religious liberty, and individualism. We are apt to forget that a system of inspection and supervision which now would seem contrary to religious freedom, was absolutely needful in the contest with a power which was using these same instrumentalities with great rigor. We believe that the educational power of a Protestant Liturgy and the supervision of Protestant Bishops were absolutely essential in the work of the Reformation, so that not only did this instrumentality succeed, but the substitute proposed by the Puritans would have failed—and had it been admitted soon after the Reformation was accomplished, it would have resulted in the return of papal error. But whatever the worth of these conclusions, this much is apparent, that not to the Puritans but to the Reformers are we indebted for the work of delivering the Church from the errors of Rome.

Another lesson from this historical review is, that the Reformation was *completed* by the English Church, and not as some assert by the subsequent movement of the Puritans. There are not

wanting the opinions of favorite historians that England is greatly indebted to the Puritans for her Protestantism. It is indeed common teaching in the schools of dissenters, that the Reformation in England was only partial, and the work of the Puritan was to attempt its completion. Now we refer any student to the different errors of Rome, in the overthrow of which the Reformation consisted, and ask which one of them was not rejected by the Church of England decisively and finally in the reign of Queen Elizabeth? Not a single mediæval doctrine or practice was left uncondemned.

We appeal to the Articles of her Faith, and with great confidence challenge any person to present a more complete anti-papal protest. We compare these Articles with any from the continental Reformers, and in no instance do we find a more entire renunciation of Romish corruptions. They are decidedly more Protestant than the Augsburg Confession, and no creed of any dissenting body be it Presbyterian, Baptist, Congregational, or Methodist, will compare in specific statement and denial of papal errors. And this silence in these confessions is direct evidence of an assumption that the abominations of Rome had already been removed.

Our final lesson is, that the Anglican Church, consisting of the Church of England and the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States, is the most distinctively Protestant Church in existence. What other body save our own has the term Protestant incorporated in its name? What other communion has such a catalogue of exiles and martyrs for Protestant truth? What other can present a declaration with the errors of Rome so specifically stated and rejected as in the Thirty-Nine Articles? What other body of divines has enriched the Church with such volumes of anti-Roman literature? And further what Church from the time of the Reformation onward to the present, has been so continually on the alert to watch against the aggression of Rome; and what other Church to-day is more awake in canvassing and refuting her claims than the Anglican Church, in each branch, which we have named?

And if we refer to the testimony of martyrs to Protestant truth, the simple statement is, that, in the English race, all of these have their names recorded in the Church of England. The dissenting bodies have never suffered unto blood striving against Rome.

And now we ask, what stronger proof can be brought for the

anti-Roman character of the Anglican Church? She presents a profession of her opposition more complete than any other in the English tongue; and then in favor of the sincerity of her profession points to her extensive literature pertaining to the questions in dispute, convincing in its arguments and learning; then to the industry, the patient toiling and self-sacrificing spirit of her more common efforts; and finally to her worthy children who suffered exile and martyrdom.

We read in Scripture, "Greater love hath no man than this," "that a man will lay down his life for his friends." We may then conclude that the Anglican Church presents not only incomparably greater evidence for the depth and sincerity of her anti-Roman convictions than any other religious body, but also a kind of evidence which cannot be transcended. Having suffered unto blood striving against Rome, she may rest satisfied with her record midst all the false charges and suspicions which would impugn her character. And yet so admirably has she preserved the integrity of truth that while truly Protestant, she is, in her Faith and Order, wholly and essentially CATHOLIC.

---

### BOOK NOTICES.

SERMONS PREACHED AT BRIGHTON BY THE LATE REV. FREDERICK W. ROBERTSON, THE INCUMBENT OF TRINITY CHAPEL. *New edition. - New York, Harper & Brothers, publishers, Franklin Square, 1870.*

Rationalism in the Church of England must ever be an exotic. Every page of her Prayer-Book marks its foreign growth, nor in this age of individualism is any form of error more insidious or dangerous than that which denies to the Scripture its inspiration and to the Church her authority. The principle of rationalistic interpretation would sweep away every supernatural element of the Divine Word, and leave nothing but a bare moral system. Concede that the account of the creation is a myth, and the life of Moses is a myth, the career of Jesus is a myth, and the whole plan of salvation through the atonement of the cross is a myth. If Satan is not a personality neither is Christ a personality. It need not, therefore, be a marvel that the entire process of the destructive criticism of Rationalism is regarded with suspicion, even when applied to matters seemingly insignificant, since any admission of its claims logically destroys all that is dearest to the Christian heart.

Could anything seduce us from the orthodox faith it would be the piety and genius of Robertson. His life was stainless. His pulpit ability was

remarkable. His power over the masses was magnetic. His humility was beautiful. His zeal was glowing. A certain fascination spreads itself over his entire career. There is a sparkle in his style whose brilliance dazzles the thoughtless into a belief of his errors, while the mysticism of his piety deludes sincere souls. Yet, after all, we aver that he is radically unsound in the great central truth of the Gospel. He loses sight of law and penalty and atonement. Is Creation merely love? Is Providence merely discipline? Is the Cross merely sympathy? Surely the suffering of this earth through generations proclaims to human consciousness the guiltiness of sin. In all the sacrificial system of the Old Testament *propitiation* is the characteristic conception. Blood flows from the victim. Blood marks the priest. Blood stains the altar. Everything in the tent of the patriarch, the tabernacle of Moses, and the temple of Solomon points to the sacrifice of the Cross. Even in heaven itself the *atonement Lamb* is the central object of worship. No where can penitence find rest from the burden of guilt but in the propitiation of our Divine Lord. To this great fact the Scriptures and the Church unite their testimony. Nor is the anger of the Father appeased by the death of His Son, the bloody vengeance depicted in the caricatures drawn by Mr. Robertson in the style of Universalist and Unitarian declaimers. It contains no element of human weakness. It is not a passion. It is a necessity. It is a sorrow. It is majestic Justice demanding its penalty to save the moral Universe from wreck, and preserve the very throne of the Almighty Sovereign. Nor do the Scriptures give us only terrible pictures of inexorable law. Love in the Godhead is the foundation of salvation. Love moves the Father in consenting to the sacrifice. Love moves the Son to endure the suffering. Love moves the Spirit to influence the sinner. The glory of the orthodox view is that mercy and justice are united by the Cross in their eternal harmony. In the scheme of Mr. Robertson the atonement only reconciles man to God, and *never* God to man. The creature, not the Creator, is to be propitiated. Violated law is nothing; to win the guilty is everything. In the Scriptural plan justice is satisfied before mercy can be exercised. This inversion of God's order taints and weakens all the discourses of our author, so that he makes repentance rather a sentiment than a duty; the suffering of the Cross not a propitiation for guilt, but a motive to holiness, and our Lord Jesus Christ a sympathizer instead of a *Saviour*. Such teaching in the Church of England is startling, and confronted by Lesson, Litany, Collect, Epistle, Gospel, Article, and Communion Office; and the preacher who dares pervert her pulpit to rationalistic error must be haunted by spectres from every part of his misunderstood and mutilated Prayer-Book, until his conscience grows either tortured or insensible, and his whole life becomes a painful discord. To prove how entirely Mr. Robertson discards the atonement as a satisfaction to Divine Justice, we will quote his own statement, where the conception is wholly omitted. He says the reconciliation it produces is fourfold:

"In the first place, Christ hath reconciled man to God. In the second place, He hath reconciled man to man; in the third place, He hath reconciled man to himself; and in the fourth place, He hath reconciled man to duty."



In combating the orthodox view of the atonement, to show how Mr. Robertson perverts truth, and then fights a phantom of blood conjured by his own fancy, we will give his own words. He says:

"I do not deny that this aspect has been given to the sacrifice of Christ. It has been represented as if the majesty of law demanded a victim, and so, as it glutted its insatiate thirst, one victim would do as well as another—the purer and more innocent the better. It has been exhibited as if Eternal Love resolved in fury to strike, and so He had His blow it mattered not whether it fell on the whole world, or on the precious head of His own Son. It represents Him in terms which better describe the ungoverned rage of Saul, missing his stroke at David, who has offended, and in disappointed fury dealing his javelin at his own son Joshua.—It is the feeling of the Siberian story; the innocent has glutted the wolves, and we may pursue our journey in safety. Christ has suffered, I am safe; He bore the agony—I take the reward. I may now live with impunity."

Surely Mr. Robertson never found in the sober and learned pages of any Anglican Divine such a miserable distortion of the truth, and what he has discovered elsewhere furnishes no apology for abandoning that doctrine of propitiation which is the centre of the Gospel, and continually taught by the Church in all ages. We have no time to show how his partial statements dissolve every obligation to the observance of a seventh day as holy to the Lord, and would eventually overturn the very foundations of Christian society. Like many brilliant writers of the Unitarian school he ignores, or distorts the arguments of his adversary, and presents his own with a startling force and in a popular style which dazzle and mislead the thoughtless.

After such severity of criticism we are glad to conclude our notice with an extract from a sermon entitled "Jacob's Wrestling," and which evinces at once great beauty of expression and great fervor of piety.

"There is a sense in which darkness has more of God than light has. He dwells in thick darkness. Moments of tender, vague mystery often bring distinctly the feeling of His presence. When day breaks, and distinctness comes, the Divine has evaporated from the soul like morning dew. In sorrow, haunted by uncertain presentiments, we feel the Infinite around us. The gloom disperses, the world's joy comes again, and it seems as if God were gone—the Being who had touched us with a withering hand, and wrestled with us, yet whose presence, even when most terrible, was more blessed than His absence. It is true, even literally, that the darkness reveals God. Every morning draws the curtain of the garish light across His eternity, and we lose the Infinite. Yes! in solitary, silent, vague darkness the Awful One is near."

**APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS, ACTS, AND REVELATIONS.** *Translated by ALEXANDER WALKER, Esq., one of her Majesty's Inspectors of Schools for Scotland. Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 38 George street, MDCCCLXX. New York, Scribner, Welford & Co., No. 654 Broadway.*

Nothing in human nature is more anomalous than the forgeries perpetrated under the name of religion, and with a seemingly pious motive. How could a pure love invent a palpable falsehood? How could a Christian conscience be deluded into a lie? How could disciples of the truth seek aid to their cause by glaring fabrications? Yet these Apocryphal fictions could scarcely be the work of enemies. Whatever our theories to ac-

count for the whole collection, or for any particular book, we find that falsehood possesses one advantage. It makes truth brighter by the contrast. The puerility, the absurdity, the nonsense of mere human inventions increase our reverence for the simplicity, the purity, the majesty of those narrations which breathe a Divine inspiration. Especially with this view should the Apocrypha be carefully studied. We have in the volume before us—translated with a close adherence to the original—THE PROTOEVANGELIUM OF JAMES; THE GOSPEL OF PSEUDO-MATTHEW; THE GOSPEL OF THE NATIVITY OF MARY; THE HISTORY OF JOSEPH THE CARPENTER; THE GOSPEL OF THOMAS; THE ARABIC GOSPEL OF THE INFANCY OF THE SAVIOUR; THE GOSPEL OF NICODEMUS; THE LETTER OF PONTIUS PILATE WHICH HE WROTE TO THE ROMAN EMPEROR CONCERNING OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST; THE REPORT OF PILATE THE PROCURATOR CONCERNING OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST; THE GIVING UP OF PILATE; THE DEATH OF PILATE; THE NARRATIVE OF JOSEPH OF ARIMATHEA; THE AVENGING OF THE SAVIOUR, with the APOCRYPHAL ACTS AND REVELATIONS.

THE ANTE-NICENE CHRISTIAN LIBRARY; TRANSLATIONS OF THE WRITINGS OF THE FATHERS DOWN TO A. D. 325. *Edited by the* REV. ALEXANDER ROBERTS, D. D., *and* JAMES DONALDSON, LL. D., VOL. XV. THE WRITINGS OF TERTULLIAN, VOL. II. Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 38 George street. New York, Messrs. Scribner, Welford & Co., 654 Broadway.

Perhaps no translations in this most admirable and valuable series will be more useful than those from the writings of Tertullian. No ancient Father surpassed him in learning or genius. His wit was sharp, versatile, penetrating. His eloquence often flowed like a tide of fire. His argumentation was as powerful as his erudition was vast. Perhaps it was his African nature, blazing like the sun under which he was born, which at last hurried into heresy this flaming defender of the truth. We might have supposed his training as an advocate would have prevented the foe of Marcion from becoming the champion of Montanus. Usually, no study like the law so cultivates common sense and dispels vague theological dreams. Possibly the eager pursuit of a false and dazzling rhetoric and the cultivation of a splendid style assisted in seducing Tertullian from the simplicity of truth. It would certainly prove a signal benefit in the study of his writings if we could trace the progressive steps of his mental and doctrinal history. Yet, however we may fail in an accurate comprehension of his character and works, the volume before us will always remain a monument of his learning and eloquence. How the man who wrote the following passage became the defender of the monstrous delusions of Montanism must ever be an inexplicable spiritual phenomenon.

"Fever, as being an evil both in its cause and in its power, as all know, we rather loathe than wonder at, and to the best of our power guard against, we having its extirpation in our power. Heresies, however, which bring with them eternal death and the heat of a stronger fire, some men prefer wondering at for possessing this power, instead of avoiding their power when they have the means of escape. But heresies would have no power if men would cease to wonder that they have such power. But it either

happens that while men wonder they fall into a snare, or because they are ensnared, they cherish their surprise, as if heresies were so powerful because of some truth which belonged to them. It would no doubt be a wonderful thing that evil should have every force of its own, were it not that heresies are in those men who are not strong in faith. In a combat of boxers and gladiators, generally speaking, it is not because a man is strong he gains the victory, or loses it because he is not strong, but because he who is vanquished is a man of no strength, and, indeed, this very conqueror, when afterwards matched against a really powerful man, actually retires crestfallen from the contest. In precisely the same way heresies derive such strength as they have from the infirmities of individuals, having no strength when they encounter a really powerful faith."

Perhaps in this very remarkable extract there is a lurking self-consciousness and exultation, whose seed, nurtured through silent years, finally flowered into a mournful heresy. The pride of splendid genius too often prepares its own overthrow. It is the brightest sun which engenders the most poisonous exhalations.

A TREATISE ON THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF MARRIAGE. *By* HUGH DAVEY EVANS, LL. D., *with a Biographical Sketch of the author, and an Appendix containing "BISHOP ANDREWES' DISCOURSE ON SECOND MARRIAGE," ETC., now printed for the first time in this country.* New York, Hurd & Houghton. Cambridge, Riverside Press, 1870.

In the East and in the West are two systems founded on lust and superstition. They are simply vast, powerful, organized adulteries, defiant towards God and ruinous towards man. But the corruptions in which they exist are natural to every human heart. Both find their defence in perverted views of the Scripture, in which they have been virtually supported by a long line of learned and pious Divines, Roman and Protestant. If God permitted polygamy in Abraham, Jacob, David, and Solomon it is hard to believe the practice intrinsically sinful, and Mohammed and Brigham Young have at least a strong apology for their lusts. Much of the criminal laxity of modern society, modern legislation, and modern jurisprudence has unquestionably arisen from the indulgence supposed to have been allowed in the Old Testament to the strength of human passions. The time has, therefore, arrived when the true doctrine of marriage should be asserted and explained. The proceedings of our American Courts are disgraceful to civilization and destructive to society, and the evils they have caused seemed to have oppressed the heart of the pious and learned Evans. In most respects few men were better qualified to grasp the subject discussed in the volume to which he devoted almost the last moments of his life. He was singularly patient, pure, and humble. He had the rare faculty of forgetting himself in his subject. He sought simple truth. His "Christian Doctrine of Marriage" is an exhaustive treatise, equally remarkable for philosophical acumen and Scriptural argument. Its style has all the purity of the author's head and heart. Occasionally we observe a repetition, perhaps traceable to extreme age, but usually the reasoning is clear, manly, and conclusive. We differ from the author in his opinion touching the right of both parties to a divorce for adultery to marry, and honor our General Convention for its in-

dependence in framing a canon which departed from the views of a man so learned, wise, and venerable.

OPINIONS CONCERNING THE BIBLE LAW OF MARRIAGE. BY ONE OF THE PEOPLE. Philadelphia, Claxton, Remsen & Haffelfinger, Nos. 819 and 821 Market street. 1871.

We are sorry that the author of so excellent a book has seen fit to conceal his name. The public have a right to all the weight of influence attaching to a writer who has devoted to a subject so vital such investigation and ability. The work is especially valuable for the earnestness and power with which it seeks to defend the Old Testament from the imputation of fostering lust by permitting polygamy. We have never seen the argument in a form more conclusive and convincing. All Christians should hail with joy efforts so sincere, zealous, and successful to place the law of marriage on its true and enduring foundation, where it is alike supported by Creation, Revelation, and Providence.

THE EARLY YEARS OF CHRISTIANITY. BY E. D. PRESSENSÉ, D. D., *Author of "Jesus Christ; His Times, Life, and Work."* Translated by ANNIE HARWOOD. THE APOSTOLIC ERA. New York. Charles Scribner & Co., 654 Broadway. 1870.

Dr. Pressensé seems to aim in his works to attain the fascination of Renan, and accomplish for the truth by glitter of style what the brilliant apostate achieves for error. If the contest between these writers related merely to the doctrine the advantage would be with the Divine, but when it becomes a rivalry of genius the skeptic has the superiority. The terseness, the vivacity, the flash of Renan spring from his native peculiarities of mind, and are not to be imitated. In Pressensé you perceive a labored, and disappointing effort to gain what is utterly beyond his power. This volume describing the Primitive Church displays cleverness of style, but exhibits little brilliance, and no power. It is meagre in learning, superficial in argument, and unsound in doctrine. The author often disposes of great questions demanding long and patient investigation, in short, condensed, oracular sentences which are always offensive, since they leave the impression that from the opinion expressed there can be no possible appeal. This book wholly fails to sustain the previous reputation of Dr. Pressensé. Its teachings in regard to Baptism and the Sabbath will awaken the suspicions of all orthodox Christians, and its views of Church Order excite distrust by their errors, and contempt by their shallowness. We will conclude our notice with some of the almost unsupported dicta of our author, which will clearly exhibit his principles. He says in his chapter on the constitution of the Church in the first century:

"Each of the Churches is a small republic, a society of believers, an association of Christians which governs itself without seeking direction or inspiration from any of its sister Churches. The entire Church is supposed to be assembled with the apostle as a council of discipline, under the invisible Presidency of our Lord Jesus Christ. No dis-

tion is made; all the believers are called together to pronounce, as a sovereign tribunal, the sentence of condemnation. The sacraments are equally far from being a monopoly of the clergy. In a word, therefore, ecclesiastical offices did not constitute in this second period, any more than in the first, a new order of priesthood. They were not directly and authoritatively instituted by God, but were created one by one as the necessity arose for them in the Church."

Yet, afterwards, most strangely and inconsistently, it is asserted that while they have no divine authority, they yet proceeded from divine inspiration. We can scarcely imagine that more looseness, vagueness—we dislike to say ignorance—could be condensed in a single chapter.

**SELF-HELP; WITH ILLUSTRATIONS OF CHARACTER, CONDUCT, AND PERSEVERANCE.** BY SAMUEL SMILES, *Author of the "Life of George Stephenson and of His Son, Robert Stephenson," "The Huguenots," Etc.* New York. Harper & Brothers. 1870.

In our age every man is, in a peculiar sense, thrown on his own resources. How many individuals and families in America having ancestral wealth and position, who, owing to an excessive refinement and culture, shrink from contact with these rough times, and fall speedily into obscurity and decay; Before many years in Europe, when establishments are dissolved, and primogenitures are abolished, and monarchies are modified, self-resource will be more than ever necessary. The biographer of the "Stephensons" and the author of the "Huguenots" is admirably qualified to cultivate that manly independence which will be more and more desirable as society advances. His mind is practical; his style is clear and forcible; his store of facts and illustrations is boundless. The very origin of this volume is a presumption in favor of its usefulness. The author prepared its materials for lectures intended to instruct illiterate workmen, and furnish them with incentives and principles to assist them in the stern battles of life. We are not surprised that his efforts bore fruit. Scholars as well as mechanics may derive benefit from this result of his sagacity and industry, and especially should our American youth study this volume significantly styled "Self-Help." We commend to them especially a single extract:

"The power of money is, on the whole, overestimated. The greatest things which have been done for the world have not been accomplished by rich men, or by subscription-lists, but by men generally of small pecuniary means. Christianity was propagated over half the world by men of the poorest class, and the greatest thinkers, discoverers, inventors, and artists have been men of moderate wealth, many of them little raised above the condition of manual laborers in point of worldly circumstances. The youth who inherits wealth is apt to have life made too easy for him, and he soon grows sated with it because he has nothing else to desire. Having no special object to struggle for he finds time hangs heavy on his hands; he remains morally and spiritually asleep, and his position in society is often no higher than that of a polypus over which the tide floats."

**HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN CIVIL WAR.** BY JOHN WILLIAM DRAPER, M. D., LL. D., *Professor of Chemistry and Physiology in the University of New York, Author of "A Treatise on Human Physiology," "A History of the*

*Intellectual Development of Europe," Etc., etc. In three volumes. Vol. III. Containing the events from the Proclamation of the Emancipation of the Slaves to the end of the War. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, Franklin Square. 1870.*

Dr. Draper is least where he esteems himself greatest, and greatest where he thinks himself least. When he theorizes he is dull, and when he describes he is graphic. He deems his collegiate position demands that he should be a philosopher, and he, therefore, encumbers his history with speculations which have no more connection with his narrative of events than the experiments and instructions of his lecture-room. Having exhausted his theories in former volumes he now emerges from a land of mists into a region of light. This conclusion of his History confines itself chiefly to a record of facts, and will sustain the reputation of the author. Dr. Draper, we think, is often singularly successful in a faithful, graphic and interesting delineation of battles. There is no painful and unnatural intensity in his descriptions, such as often disgusts in the pages of Headley. He grasps strongly the characteristic features of the scene, and with a few vivid words paints his picture plainly for the eye. The entire work is marked by a spirit of manly fairness, and gives evidence of patient research, and will certainly take its rank with the best histories of a war which has not only shaped the future of our own country, but left its impress on the entire world. It demonstrated that the railroad and the telegraph had revolutionized all previous methods, and that the conflicts of nations are hereafter to be remarkable for the vastness of armies, the destructiveness of weapons, and the brevity of the struggle. The present war of Europe passes before the eye like a gigantic panorama painted in blood and unrolled by a steam engine.

CHRIST IN SONG; HYMNS OF IMMANUEL, SELECTED FROM ALL AGES WITH NOTES. BY PHILIP SCHAFF, D. D. New York, Anson D. F. Randolph & Co., No. 770 Broadway, 1870.

The learned compiler has undertaken in this volume a difficult work. First, the title of his book confines him to hymns relating to our Lord, and thus is excluded a large class of compositions celebrating God in Creation and Providence rather than in Redemption. The beautiful lines of Cowper—so simple, so musical, so inspiring, breathing such faith and tenderness—beginning,

"God moves in a mysterious way,"

do not fall within the scheme of the present enterprise. Again, if the compiler selects only the *best* songs of the Church he fills his pages with verses everywhere familiar in Christian families and assemblies; or if he omits hymns made universal by pious genius he must encumber his work by inferior productions dragged from their deserved obscurity. Moreover, the book, by its title, is properly restricted to poetical compositions, written to be *sung*, whereas the very prelude to the volume contradicts the purpose in



dedicated, since its length, measure, and character make it practically unsuitable for musical use, either in private or public worship. A similar remark applies to other selections. We cannot say that Dr. Schaff has overcome all the difficulties of his enterprise, but he has accomplished whatever was possible, and the publishers have performed most creditably their part. Among the best things in the volume is the beautiful beginning of the Preface written by its compiler, and expressing admirably his liberal and noble views:

"Christ is the centre of sacred art as well as of theology and religion. The noblest works of the master-painters are attempts to portray His 'human face divine'—now in the charm of childhood, now in the agony of the cross, now in the glory of the resurrection, now in His majesty as Judge of the world. The "Hymns of Jesus" are the Holy of holies in the temple of sacred poetry. From this sanctuary every doubt is banished; here the passions of sense, pride, and unholy ambition give way to the tears of penitence, the joys of faith, the emotions of love, the aspirations of hope, the anticipations of heaven; here the dissensions of rival churches and theological schools are hushed into silence; here the hymnists of ancient, mediæval, and modern times, from every section of Christendom—profound divines, stately Bishops, humble monks, faithful pastors, devout laymen, holy women—unite with one voice in the common adoration of a common Saviour. He is the theme of all ages, tongues, and creeds; the divine harmony of all human discords; the solution of all the dark problems of life."

THE THEOLOGY OF CHRIST FROM HIS OWN WORDS. BY JOSEPH P. THOMPSON. New York. Charles Scribner & Co. 1870.

Here is a volume inscribed to learned Divines, prepared upon a plan believed to be novel; intended for theological seminaries, and commended to the universal Church. The Preface excited expectations of an erudite and exhaustive treatise. There could scarcely be a wider chasm between a promise and a performance. We should pronounce this book of Dr. Thompson's scarcely fit in style or matter for the pupils of a Bible class, or the audience of a lecture-room. The chapter styled "A Living Providence" is a curiosity in religious literature. Its first three pages have all the sensationalism of an extemporaneous address, and we can imagine that they have been more than once used in some placarded harangue. Indeed, in every part of the volume we have had our suspicions excited that the materials had been furnished from speeches and sermons which had served their purpose on the platform and in the pulpit. We can imagine that Dr. Bacon, as he perused this work of his former pupil, must have frequently lifted his spectacles with an equivocal smile, and we are certain that the students of Andover would scarcely respect it as a text-book.

PROVERBS, ECCLESIASTES, AND THE SONG OF SOLOMON, WITH NOTES, CRITICAL EXPLANATORY, AND PRACTICAL. DESIGNED FOR BOTH PASTORS AND PEOPLE. BY REV. HENRY COWLES, D.D.—New York. D. Appleton & Co., 90, 92, 94 Grand St. 1870.

There is scarcely any religious problem more puzzling than the career of Solomon. The child of Wisdom, specially endowed by Heaven, and whose Proverbs will instruct all generations, gives the lie to his own inspired teach-

ings, and becomes a son of folly. He who so realized the hollowness of earth; the uncertainty of life, and the nearness of death, abandoned himself to chase the phantoms of pleasure. He who celebrated in his youth that human love which is the chosen type of the divine, in his age is ensnared by women, and guilty of the very sin against which his most pointed aphorisms are directed. Above all, he who constructed the Temple to Almighty God, and brought from heaven into its Holiest by his prayers the descending and abiding glory, at last forsakes the worship of Jehovah, and bows before the altars and images of idolatry. It is difficult whether most to wonder at such a defection, or the honesty of the inspired writers who dare its record. Of course a career so marvelous and eccentric as that of Solomon's must originate many difficult critical inquiries. In regard to the Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and Canticles we have questions of authenticity, and authorship, and text, and interpretation, which require for their solution the utmost candor, patience, learning, and ability. Much dreamy nonsense has collected around the writings of the wise man which requires to be dissipated. Absurd theories have to be exploded; learned rubbish must be cleared away; rash extremes are to be avoided. Perhaps no author has brought to the execution of such a work more sound judgment than Dr. Cowles. His erudition is not great; but he possesses solid judgment, patient industry, and a sincere love of truth. With such gifts an Ohio minister may accomplish more for healthful and useful criticism than learned German or English professors amid all the literary treasures of vast, antiquated, renowned European libraries, where common sense is too often despised, and mere erudition worshiped. Every man who wishes instruction in regard to the writings of Solomon will find valuable assistance in this excellent book of Dr. Cowles.

THE ROB ROY ON THE JORDAN. NILE. RED SEA, AND GENNESARETH, ETC. A CANOE CRUISE IN PALESTINE AND EGYPT, AND THE WATERS OF DAMASCUS. BY J. MACGREGOR, M. A. *With Maps and Illustrations.* New York. Harper & Brothers, Publishers, Franklin Square. 1870.

We do not think that Mr. MacGregor has added materially to the stores of human knowledge. We do not arise from the perusal of his book much wiser than when we began. But we have been entertained. The novelty of eating, sleeping, and traveling in an English canoe on the waters of Africa and Asia has its attractions. Besides, the simplicity and earnestness of the explorer give a certain freshness to the volume. If never particularly vivacious or instructive, he is often pleasing and interesting. Once he almost made a discovery, which he relates with amusing gravity. He is on the Kishon; he is at breakfast; he dips a can in the water. Lo, a measured, breathing, gurgling, hissing sound, and near his hand—a crocodile. Yes! a crocodile. He is sure it is a crocodile, and yet not quite certain. Important reflections speedily follow. How invaluable this discovery! The animal knocks below against the "Rob Roy." The shore is hastily reached, and footprints joyfully observed. If traces of the crocodile in the waters of Palestine constitute the chief discovery of our traveler we must not limit the

worth of his book by the insignificance of such an achievement. The novelty of his plan and the boldness of its execution always lend interest to his narrative.

THE LIFE OF MARY RUSSELL MITFORD, AUTHORESS OF "OUR VILLAGE," ETC. *Told by herself in letters to her friends. Edited by the Rev. A. G. K. L'Estrange. In two volumes. New York. Harper & Brothers, Franklin Square. 1870.*

A brief biography embracing the principal events of Miss Mitford's life and written in a vivacious style would have possessed more interest to the general reader than the present collection of her letters. Thoughtful persons, however, will prefer to study the career and character of a genius so brilliant in words poured forth in all the confidence of affection and friendship. These volumes are singularly rich and suggestive. The relations of Miss Mitford to her father invest her entire life with the colors of romance. He was evidently a heartless man of the world—an Apollo in appearance, lavish in expenditure, frank in manner, and with some strange fascination over his gifted daughter. After squandering his wife's estate and a large sum drawn by his little daughter in a lottery, he did not hesitate to stake recklessly at the gaming table money which filial affection earned during years of weary, thankless, exhausting toil. Nothing in literary history is more marvelous, or more interesting, than the heroic devotion of a noble daughter to her unworthy father, who expended on his selfish pleasures the proceeds of so much genius.

The letters which fill these volumes are not only interesting because they unveil the struggles and opinions of a remarkable woman, but also because they bring to our view, in a manner so unconscious and so graphic, many of the distinguished personages of a former generation. After seeing the heroes of the stage strut in their paint and tinsel beneath the glare of brilliant lights, we are sometimes pleased to observe them behind the scenes, in their ordinary tones and manners and attire. Amid all the bright nonsense and rattling gaieties of these letters it is pleasing to remark that Miss Mitford cherished in her heart a sincere faith, which shed its mild glory over her closing life.

HOME INFLUENCE; A TALE FOR MOTHERS AND DAUGHTERS. BY GRACE AGUILAR. *A new edition. New York. D. Appleton & Co., 90, 92 and 94 Grand St. 1870.*

Nothing can be more painful than the delicate sensibilities of genius subjected to the rough experiences of life. That intensity which is necessary to vivid conception and expression brings with it suffering. Thus, the path of an author to success often lies through a region of inevitable pain. Grace Aguilar did not escape the stern ordination, although, in her case, there was no peculiar trial. Her father was devoted. Her mother was affectionate. Her brothers were kind. Her home was surrounded by much that was attractive and beautiful, and her youth breathed an atmosphere of love. Yet, the ordinary sorrows of life exhausted its springs, and her sensi-

tive nature early found repose in the grave. But during her few years of labor she produced much that excites interest and deserves study. "Home Influence." is everywhere bright with marks of genius. Its sweetness, its purity, its refinement contrast strangely with the coarseness, the vulgarity, the masculinity which too often characterize works of women now teeming from the press, to roughen the thoughtless and disgust the cultivated.

THE NEW TIMOTHY. BY WM. M. BAKER, *Author of "Inside," "Oak Mot," "The Virginians in Texas," "Life and Labors of Daniel Baker," Etc. etc.* New York. Harper & Brothers, Publishers. Franklin Square. 1870.

The aim of this tale is excellent. Perhaps nothing in this country and age is more noticeable than the fact that the young men who issue from our Theological Seminaries, while often furnished with discipline and learning, are seldom remarkable for experience and tact. The associations of the preparing lawyer, even at college, fit him for the world, and his discipline in the office gives him a knowledge not only of the principles of his profession, but of the ways of men. He is not usually a fledgling when he makes his first appearance in Court. The young physician also is placed in a situation where he observes the world before he commences his practice. But even at college, the student who has the ministry in view, is, from that very fact isolated, and in the Theological Seminary he is a mere recluse, buried from common life among men least of all acquainted with its modes and spirit. His sermons are mercilessly criticised until every trace of nature and every gleam of originality have evaporated like the aroma from powdered rose-leaves. He wanders forth in the world and not of it, and perhaps wastes years in chasing phantoms before he acquires experience. No problem is more perplexing than to maintain our thoroughness and exactitude in theological training, and at the same time educate Clergymen into a manliness which, without sacrificing truth or dignity, shall be in sympathy with the age and country. The author of the "New Timothy" has read the difficulty we have named, and sought in his book to illustrate its solution. His hero is a young minister fresh from the Divinity School, who finds himself suddenly amid the hard, rough, boisterous scenes of border-life in Texas, and whose sense and piety gradually adapt themselves to his situation and conquer practical success. The plan of the novel is well conceived; the characters are drawn with spirit; the style is vivacious, and the interest is usually maintained. Considered as the work of a pastor occupied with the innumerable cares of a family and a parish, the vigor and originality of the tale are remarkable. The dialogue is especially vivacious. However, in the plot there is no culmination; in the characters there is no development, and in the interest there is no increase. Mr. Baker is rather a clever photographer than a creative artist.

FREE RUSSIA. BY WILLIAM HEPWORTH DIXON, *Author of "Free America," "Her Majesty's Tower," Etc., etc.* New York. Harper & Brothers, Publishers, Franklin Square. 1870.

More than twenty years since we found in an obscure farm-house a won-

derful book called "Fleming's Apocalyptic Key." It modestly professed to give a clew to the tangled mazes of the Revelation, and such was the impression it made that memory after so long an interval can recall its scheme. The volume was written by a Scotch Presbyterian clergyman who settled in London, and was published in the first decade of the eighteenth century. It maintained that the seven seals of the Apocalypse represented seven judgments under the Roman Empire; that the seven trumpets signified seven events which extended the Papal domination; and that the seven vials were seven retributions poured on Satan's kingdom in various parts of the world. It was indicated that the Pope in 1848 would lose his temporal throne, which he was to regain, and be hurled from it soon a second time. Then the domination of Mohammedanism was doomed to speedy overthrow. Bismarck and Gortschakoff seem to have arranged the fulfilment of this programme sketched nearly two centuries since by an humble Scotch preacher, and the present vast war is but a development of their policy. Prussia has already, indirectly, but most effectually, terminated the temporal sway of the Pope, and Russia appears preparing to terminate the European sway of the Turk. It is almost certain that the Cross will supplant the Crescent, and the Muscovite Capital be reflected in the waters of the Golden Horn. The freedom of the serf and reform in the Church have been fitting Russia to fulfill the predestined will of Heaven. Amid such vast movements of the nations as are now changing the map of Europe, everything touching the Empire of the Czar is invested with peculiar interest. Mr. Dixon could not have selected a more popular theme for his book. We could have wished it treated in a more sober and reliable manner. Our author is bright, sprightly, agreeable. You follow him always with pleasure, and often with profit. He seldom flags; he has the dash of a locomotive; but necessarily with its rapidity of movement you are whirled away from the possibility of minute observation. The scene is fascinating as you rush amid objects glancing, dancing, turning, until your eye is bewildered. Your mind has been filled with multiplied images of beauty, and is yet satisfied with none. We rise from the perusal of Mr. Hepworth's book often delighted, but with something of the feeling experienced after a rapid railway ride through a peculiarly interesting region. Much has been hastily seen and little has been truly learned. Readers for amusement will buy "Free Russia," while readers for instruction will procure something more solid and reliable. We may also venture to notice an unpleasant impression made by this volume, and by those produced in a similar way. The question "Will it pay?" is suggested from title-page to conclusion. Amid all the most sacred scenes of nature, and the most striking collections of art, we know the writer is cogitating what he shall sketch to make his picture sell. Whether he converses with a beggar, or is presented to a prince, his powers are ever awake to observe some word, or note some incident which will *take* with the publisher or the public. Sordidness in this age, more than any other poison, is corrupting its literature.

THE AMERICAN ANNUAL CYCLOPÆDIA AND REGISTER OF IMPORTANT EVENTS OF THE YEAR 1869. EMBRACING POLITICAL, CIVIL, MILITARY, AND SOCIAL AFFAIRS, PUBLIC DOCUMENTS, BIOGRAPHY, STATISTICS, COMMERCE, FINANCE, LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AGRICULTURE, AND MECHANICAL INDUSTRY. *Volume IX.* New York. D. Appleton & Co., 90, 92 and 94 Grand St. 1870.

Every annual volume of this admirable work is remarkable for the fullness of its information. We do not think the last inferior to its predecessors. Turn to any particular topic! We select that treating of the Roman Catholic Church, and quote a few paragraphs giving most valuable statistical information:

"There were in December, 1869, 55 Cardinals, of whom 5 were Cardinal Bishops (one See being vacant), 42 Cardinal Priests, and 8 Cardinal Deacons; 39 were Italians by birth, and only 16 non-Italians; 7 French, 4 Spanish, 3 Germans, 1 Portuguese, and 1 Irish. According to the *Annuario Pontificio*, for 1869, there were twelve Patriarchs of the Latin and Oriental rite, 12 Latin Archbishops immediately dependent on the Holy See, 120 with ecclesiastical provinces; 7 Oriental Archbishops; total, 139 Archbishops. Of Latin Bishops, there are 6 called Suburbicarians, always Cardinals with Sees near Rome; 84 immediately subject to the Holy See, and 570 with Dioceses; 66 Bishops of the Oriental rite; total, 723.

BIBLE NOTES FOR DAILY READERS, A COMMENT ON THE HOLY SCRIPTURES. BY EZRA M. HUNT, A. M., M. D., *Author of "Grace Culture," Etc.* New York. Charles Scribner & Co., 654 Broadway.

Perhaps no work requires more profound learning, more consummate judgment, and more patient industry than a popular commentary on the Holy Scriptures. To master the entire field, and then to gather from it only what is important to the general reader presupposes a double gift. It is indeed easier to prepare a treatise for the learned than a commentary for the people. The man is bold who ventures such a task. If candor, zeal, and industry could have ensured success Dr. Hunt's labors would be pronounced triumphant. We cannot affirm that he has succeeded in his vast undertaking, but we do not doubt that his work will prove to many a valuable aid to the study of the Divine Word. It strikes us that the usual plan of giving the Scripture text entire would be far preferable to that adopted. The inconvenience of having two books to examine at once is not compensated by the diminution in the bulk of these volumes. We suggest that the translation of "Genesis" by "*production*," in the second line of the Introduction, does not excite confidence in the accuracy of the author's scholarship.

A COMMENTARY ON THE HOLY SCRIPTURES; CRITICAL, DOCTRINAL, AND HOMILETICAL, WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO MINISTERS AND STUDENTS. BY JOHN PETER LANGÉ, D. D., *in connection with a number of eminent European Divines. Translated from the German, revised, enlarged, and edited by PHILIP SCHAFF, D. D., in connection with American scholars of various Evangelical Denominations. Vol. VII. of the New Testament, containing the Epistles of Paul to the Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, and Colossians.* New York. Charles Scribner & Co., 654 Broadway. 1870.



This valuable Commentary seems to unite in itself almost every advantage possible. The theological acquisitions of the original author are rich even for Germany, and his access to libraries enabled him to command the literary wealth of Europe. Dr. Schaff, with much of the erudition of his fatherland, has also the practical sense of his adopted country. The American Divines whom he has summoned to his assistance have extensive and varied qualifications for their laborious work. Perhaps no Commentary concentrates upon itself more which renders it useful in the exposition of the Holy Scriptures to scholars and ministers. Of course, Churchmen regret the absence of principles which they so much cherish, but their liberality is always disposed to acknowledge merit, and their culture will appreciate the achievements of pious learning. We venture to suggest that some statements in the Introduction to the Epistle to the Galatians are unguarded. It is said :

"As implied in the occasion of writing indicated above, the Apostle intended by this, his Epistle, to destroy the influence which the Judaizing teachers, with their legal doctrine, had gained in the Galatian Churches, and to bring anew to general acknowledgment—in the first place, his apostolic authority, and next, on this basis, of the Gospel preached by him, of the sinner's justification through faith, and of the freedom of the believer from the law." Again, "In this he sets himself in complete opposition to the legal tendency itself, or to the opinion of a necessity of the observance of the law to the attainment of salvation."

Surely, such language is liable to serious misconstruction, and may occasion grave practical errors. Obedience to the Law is certainly no ground for a believer's justification, but it is, without question, the rule of a believer's life. 1. The Law carries conviction to the conscience. 2. The Law compels to faith in Christ as the sole instrument of our acceptance. 3. The Law becomes the standard of our duty, according to which we must measure our motives and regulate our actions. After justification, filial love, indeed, supplants servile fear, but releases from no moral obligation. To affirm without qualification that the believer is free from the law, and that its observance is not necessary to salvation, is essential antinomianism. While faith justifies the sinner obedience is essential to the Christian.

AN ENGLISH GREEK LEXICON. BY C. D. YONGE. WITH MANY NEW ARTICLES, AN APPENDIX OF PROPER NAMES, AND PILLON'S GREEK SYNONYMS, TO WHICH IS PREFIXED AN ESSAY ON THE ORDER OF WORDS IN ATTIC GREEK PROSE. BY CHARLES SHORT, LL. D., *Professor of Latin in Columbia College, New York.* Edited by HENRY DRISLER, LL. D., *Professor of Greek in Columbia College, Editor of "Liddell & Scott's Greek-English Lexicon,"* Etc., etc. New York. Harper & Brothers, Publishers, Franklin Square. 1870.

Perhaps no literary work undertaken on the American Continent has demanded such extensive learning as the volume we now propose to notice. The plan and execution of the English original were each excellent. They are thus stated in a brief extract from the Preface of the first edition :

"In the work as it now stands my aim has been to exhibit a complete English vocabulary, so far, at least, as there are words in Greek, by which the English words can be literally or adequately rendered, and where this cannot be done, to supply, wherever practicable, the deficiency by phrases. In every instance I have cited the authority for the word or phrase given, so that the student may see at once whether an expression be poetical, and if so, whether in general use, or confined to Epic Poetry, or to Tragedy, or of a later date and belonging to the era of Theocritus and Apollonius; or whether it be found also in prose, or only in prose, and whether used by the historians, the orators, or the philosophers."

Dr. Drisler, in his own Preface, says:

"The editor has endeavored in the main to carry out the principles of the original work. In his own additions he has given authority for all new words introduced, but he has contented himself with referring to the class of writers generally, when a word was used by a particular class, instead of specifying the individual writers."

The labor and learning expended by the American editor on his great work are most commendable. His judgment equals his scholarship, and both reflect honor on his institution and his country. We sincerely hope his pecuniary reward will correspond to his merit, his zeal, and his reputation.

Dr. Short has contributed to the volume an essay on "The Order of Words in Attic Greek Prose," which we predict will be a standard for reference not probably to be supplanted. Its fullness, clearness, and arrangement have not been surpassed. We have not had time for a minute examination of Mr. Arnold's translation of Pillon, but we are certain that it deserves a place in a volume which almost commences a new era in American scholarship. In this age of superficial labor and sensational writing we can scarcely honor too much the pure, solid, conserving influence of the men who thus bury themselves from the popular gaze while examining the very foundations of a language which has so widely moulded the thought and speech and conduct of the human family. How preferable the steady light of their scholarship to the rocket-glare which dazzles the multitude!

LECTURES ON ART DELIVERED BEFORE THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD  
IN HILARY TERM. 1870. BY JOHN RUSKIN, M. A. 16mo. pp. 153.  
London and New York, Macmillan & Co. 1870.

It is a significant change in modern education that John Ruskin, the first of living art critics, should himself be the professor of this new department of study in a University where the attention has so long been given almost exclusively to the classics. This widening of the range of culture is sure to result in the better application of art, as it is a happy thing for the new movement that it is willingly inaugurated by a man of genius, who in his ripest years consents to impart to pupils in Lectures his choicest conclusions on the studies of his life. These Lectures deserve a wider audience than the University, and their prompt publication is both wise and happy. It would be hard to find anywhere so much true and searching criticism as is contained in these seven Lectures. The Place of Art in Education, the Relation of Art to Religion, the Relation of Art to Morals, the Relation of Art

to Use, Line, Light, Color are the subjects, and the course of thought is that which gives a right conception of Art itself.

Mr. Ruskin's treatment is characteristic. With the keenest and truest remarks on the uses of Art, and the uses which it serves, he cannot help running off into moralizings which themselves true and excellent have almost nothing to do with the subject in hand; and yet this almost erratic breadth and fullness gives this little volume a suggestive value which is perhaps Mr. Ruskin's own best contribution to the thought of his time. The most imaginative prose writer in the language, having a style clear, simple, idiomatic, expressive, he imparts to whatever subject he takes up a wonderful freshness and life. The present volume, as giving right conceptions of art, and as showing the connection of all high art with character, is a contribution of the greatest value to literature; and open as very many of its statements are to criticism, and abounding, like all that Mr. Ruskin writes, in a certain fine extravagance, it is yet a work which can be read again and again, and contains more of the statements of the results of very wide study and discursive experience than anything Mr. Ruskin has previously given. He could have only written these Lectures after so many years of study, and they contain the wise conclusions of many years of thought.

MORNING AND EVENING EXERCISES; SELECTED FROM THE PUBLISHED AND UNPUBLISHED WRITINGS OF THE REV. HENRY WARD BEECHER. Edited by LYMAN ABBOTT, Author of "*Jesus of Nazareth*," "*Old Testament Shadows*," etc. New York. Harper & Brothers, Publishers, Franklin Square. 1871.

This volume exhibits Mr. Beecher in his best aspects. There are in it occasional expressions rash and almost irreverent, but none of those witticisms and vulgarities which too often degrade and profane the Plymouth Pulpit. We do not wonder that such glowing and truthful eloquence as everywhere gushes and brightens through these pages attracts and charms the multitude. Christ is in it a present power to help and heal. God is not here a doctrine, but a presence, filling the Universe, and breathing over the heart and drawing humanity towards heaven. Mr. Beecher's defective teachings in regard to the atonement do not appear. The volume is a treasury of genius, where manly sense and splendid fancy clothe their thoughts and images in words strong and striking and beautiful.

LIGHT AT EVENING TIME; A BOOK OF SUPPORT AND COMFORT FOR THE AGED. Edited by JOHN STANFORD HOLME, D. D. New York. Harper & Brothers, publishers, Franklin Square. 1871.

When Christian age has withdrawn itself from the cares of active life, and is looking upward calmly with hope toward heaven, it has special privileges for pious meditation. It is pausing between a past of battles in this scene of war and an eternal future of peace, joy, and glory, and is furnished with materials for reflection from two worlds. This volume, properly styled "*Light at Evening Time*," is compiled for persons who have reached the period of life just described. The selections are from the choicest

Christian writers, living and dead, and seem in all respects adapted to the purpose proposed.

**THE CHILDREN'S CRUSADE; AN EPISODE OF THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY.**

BY GEORGE ZABRISKIE GRAY. New York. Published by Hurd & Houghton, Cambridge, Riverside Press. 1870.

We are thankful that Mr. Gray has collected with so much patient toil from a variety of sources all that is reliable in regard to one of the most marvellous and most melancholy movements recorded by history. Fact here transcends Fiction. But we will not enter the charmed region. Mr. Gray has told his story sometimes tediously, but usually well, and the publishers have successfully employed their celebrated skill to please the eye, and improve the taste of American children.

**THE BOTTOM OF THE SEA.** BY L. SONREL. *Translated and edited by ELIHU RICH.* New York. Charles Scribner & Co. 1870.

**WONDERFUL BALLOON ASCENTS; OR, THE CONQUEST OF THE SKIES. A HISTORY OF BALLOONS AND BALLOON VOYAGES.** *From the French of F. MARION, with illustrations.* New York. Charles Scribner & Co. 1870.

**WONDERS OF ACOUSTICS; OR, THE PHENOMENA OF SOUND.** *From the French of RODOLPHE RADAN. The English revised by ROBERT BALL, M. A., with illustrations.* New York. Charles Scribner & Co. 1870.

**WONDERS OF BODILY STRENGTH AND SKILL IN ALL AGES AND COUNTRIES.** *Translated and enlarged from the French of GUILLAUME DEPPING by CHARLES RUSSELL, with numerous illustrations.* New York. Charles Scribner & Co. 1871.

We are glad that this admirable series of translations from the French is continued. Nothing could be better adapted to please and instruct our children. Science may not, perhaps should not, expel Fiction from their libraries, but in such forms she will accomplish much in cultivating a healthful taste for knowledge.

**MY APINGI KINGDOM; WITH LIFE IN THE GREAT SAHARA AND SKETCHES OF THE CHASE OF THE OSTRICH, HYENA, ETC.** BY PAUL DU CHAILLU. *Numerous engravings.* New York. Harper & Brothers, publishers, Franklin Square. 1871.

**ADVENTURES OF A YOUNG NATURALIST.** BY LUCIEN BIART. *Edited and adapted by PARKER GILLMORE, with one hundred and seventeen illustrations.* New York. Harper & Brothers, publishers, Franklin Square. 1871.

**CHRIST, OR THE WORLD! WHICH?** BY COUSIN FLORENCE. Baltimore. George Lycett, 44 Lexington street.

**CHRISTINE THORNTON; OR, WHO IS MY NEIGHBOR? AN EASTER STORY,** by E. R. New York. E. P. Dutton & Co., 713 Broadway.

**THE CASTAWAYS; A STORY OF ADVENTURES IN THE WILDS OF BORNEO.** BY CAPTAIN MAYNE REID. New York. Sheldon & Co., 498 and 500 Broadway.

